

California State University, San Bernardino

CSUSB ScholarWorks

Theses Digitization Project

John M. Pfau Library

1993

The trials of creativity: A rhetorical analysis of A View from the Bridge and The Crucible by Arthur Miller

Edward Hal Garnett

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project>



Part of the [Literature in English, North America Commons](#), and the [Rhetoric Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Garnett, Edward Hal, "The trials of creativity: A rhetorical analysis of A View from the Bridge and The Crucible by Arthur Miller" (1993). *Theses Digitization Project*. 3032.

<https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/3032>


This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.


THE TRIALS OF CREATIVITY:
A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF A *VIEW FROM THE BRIDGE* AND
THE CRUCIBLE BY ARTHUR MILLER

A Thesis
Presented to the
Faculty of
California State University,
San Bernardino

by
Edward Hal Garnett
June 1993

Approved by:


Dr. Elinore Partridge, Chair, English


Dr. Rodney Simard, English


Dr. Ronald Barnes, Theater Arts

5/11/93
Date

ABSTRACT

A theme prevalent in Arthur Miller's two dramas, *The Crucible* and *A View from the Bridge*, is the plight of individuals pressured by society to compromise their peers and/or ideals. Miller created these dramas—both staged during the 1950s when the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC) investigated many American writers for supporting Communist ideologies—as rhetorical vehicles designed to alert his audience to what he considered a major social and political injustice.

Considering Miller's public opposition to the hearings and his indictment for refusing to inform on a colleague, the similarities between his subject matter and the HUAC hearings are no surprise. Miller's plays are significant, however, not because of overt references to the hearings but because Miller capitalized on the inherent rhetorical nature of drama and used language to induce pathos in his audience as well as to exemplify the risks and consequences of conforming to authority.

In *View* and *Crucible*, Miller used language not only to make theatergoers of the 1950s *aware* of the similarities between his plays and the Congressional hearings, but also to make his audience *feel* the injustices being addressed. Rhetorical elements such as syntax, diction, repetition, stage directions, and the dramatic emphasis noted in his punctuation, through implicit and explicit means, temporarily "victimized" the audience, forcing their acknowledgment of the injustices suffered by Marco and Rodolpho in *View*, John Proctor in *Crucible*, or Miller himself in his testimony before HUAC.

Miller's rhetorical strategies are effective because they are assimilated by his audience and serve as a warning for current and future generations of theatergoers. Miller's sociopolitical message—that the act of informing, regardless of the informer's motivations, can cause innocent people to suffer needlessly—is communicated via rhetorical modes that force his audience to consider the subject matter on different levels. Drama's communicative properties, according to theorists like Martin Esslin, are influential for changing the attitudes of society. If this is true, Miller's rhetorical efforts serve as a beacon to the public, reminding us to remain alert for the warning signs of injustice, and affirming the importance of taking a stand against unjust entities, like HUAC, whenever they surface.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I extend my gratitude to Professors Elinore Partridge, Rodney Simard, and Ronald Barnes for their assistance and guidance throughout the composition of this thesis, as well as Professor Bruce Golden for helping me narrow the scope of my topic. I also thank those dearest to me—my wife, my mother, and my father—for believing in me throughout my educational and artistic endeavors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
CHAPTER ONE:	
Introduction	1
CHAPTER TWO:	
Rhetorical Techniques in <i>A View from the Bridge</i>	7
CHAPTER THREE:	
Rhetorical Techniques in <i>The Crucible</i>	42
CHAPTER FOUR:	
Conclusion	78
NOTES	85
WORKS CITED	86

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

To me the theater is not a disconnected entertainment, which it usually is to most people here. It's the sound and the ring of the spirit of the people at any one time. It is where a collective mass of people, through the genius of some author, is able to project its terrors and its hopes and to symbolize them. (Miller, *Essays* 311)

This statement by Arthur Miller portrays the playwright as one who seeks to create plays not solely or exclusively for entertainment but to write plays as a way to influence his audience and ultimately influence society. For Miller, theatergoers are far more than mere spectators; they are, if they can be impassioned by a play, catalysts for social change. He states: "By whatever means it is accomplished, the prime business of a play is to arouse the passions of its audience so that by the route of passion may be opened up new relationships between a man and men, and between men and Man" (*Essays* 168).

Miller believes a playwright should offer insights into the human condition: "... an artist was obliged to point a way out if he thought he knew what it was" (*Timebends* 145). Martin Esslin concurs with the notion that drama provides an effective mode for the communication of ideas between the originator of a play and the audience:

Drama has become one of the principal means of communication of ideas and, even more importantly, modes of human behaviour in our civilisation: drama provides some of the principal role models by which individuals form their identity and ideals, sets patterns of communal behaviour, forms values and aspirations, and has become part of the collective fantasy life of the masses. . . . (*Field* 13-14)

In addition to reflecting commonly agreed upon behavior patterns between a dramatic work and the audience, drama also allows the playwright and other conceptual originators of the performance to use the play as a mode of personal expression:

To attract their audience, to hold its attention, to express their view of the world, the originators of a dramatic performance must, of course, have had something in mind, something they wanted to express, to show, to demonstrate: a story to tell, an idea to embody. (Esslin, *Field* 175)

What message was Miller trying to address in his plays *A View from the Bridge* and *The Crucible*? Judging from the historical context in which these plays were presented to the public, circa 1953-55, Miller examines the exploits of the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC)—prompted by the influence of men like Senator Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin, Roy Cohn, and J. Edgar Hoover—in their quest to rid America of Communist infiltration. Of particular interest to Miller was the plight of those in the entertainment industry who (based on the confessions of informers, often friends or co-workers of the accused, attempting to purge themselves of their alleged Communist ties before the House Committee) were subjected to life on the notorious Hollywood blacklist. In “The Plight of the Left-Wing Screenwriter,” Tom Dardis discusses the dilemma facing blacklisted writers:

A writer who had incurred the wrath of the House Committee became a social pariah, a non-person without constitutional rights and absolutely unemployable in the film industry. No matter how strong your case, if you attempted to fight the blacklist by resorting to the courts, as long as the issue was in any way concerned with Communism, you could not win it. (39-40)

As Victor Navasky notes in *Naming Names*, the implications of the blacklist were devastating on personal and professional levels. Navasky chronicles the impact that informers had on Hollywood:

People in Hollywood lost not only their myths (of the happy ending, among others) their careers, possessions, place status, and space, but also their sense of self. The disintegration of social bonds abruptly threw people back on their own resources. Marriages broke, personalities dissolved in alcohol, some went to court, some into exile, and some into mental institutions. Others found themselves and their true identities, but life was never the same again. (369-70)

Miller was clearly outraged by the blacklist and the tactics employed by HUAC not only because of the quandary faced by his peers called before the Committee but also because he felt the actions of the Committee were unconstitutional. Miller states that the Communist Party as well as its fronts were legal in America and he felt these factions posed no threat to the American way of life (*Timebends* 329). Bernard F. Dick also comments on the unconstitutionality of this issue: "Congress cannot investigate what it cannot legislate; unable to legislate one's politics, theoretically, Congress should not be able to investigate them" (9).

As a playwright, Miller was, in many ways, exempt from the stranglehold HUAC had on the entertainment industry in the 1940s and 1950s. This is not to say that Miller did not encounter the wave of hysteria sweeping across America at the time. According to Navasky, Miller was blacklisted by a number of organizations, including the New York Board of Education, which canceled his contract to write a film about gangs (215). Yet, for the most part, Miller could address any subject matter he wanted, and in the mid-fifties, this centered on informers and the repercussions of informing, topics directly associated with the HUAC hearings. The rhetorical techniques inherent in drama offered Miller the tools he needed to alert theatergoers to the inequity plaguing the McCarthy era as well as persuade his audience against the notion of informing on another to save self.

Despite Miller's goal to guide his audience, influencing theatergoers is an unpredictable task since textual indicators are, in production, competing with the abundant visual and aural cues of a performance and may not be fully realized by the audience: "At any given instant during the performance the spectator's attention must be focused on the one or two elements among these hundreds of sense data that appear most essential" (Esslin, *Field* 151). Esslin elaborates by saying that the audiences' perceptions of a play is based on a process of selection and screening among the multitude of data they are witnessing (*Field* 151). Miller's rhetorical

strategies function as conscious and subliminal markers that influence the audiences' perceptions and ultimately guide them toward what the author considers to be the play's central meaning; therefore, to understand Miller's meaning, we must first understand his rhetoric in the specific medium and its unique considerations.

In *Teaching the Universe of Discourse*, James Moffett comments that drama is the perfect place to begin the study of rhetoric: "The guts of drama is rhetoric, people acting on each other; speech is featured but nonverbal influence is highly prized, to say the least" (116). Drama is an effective medium for Miller in conveying his concerns because rhetorical language implicitly or explicitly urges people to action (Harrington 5).

Because a play has the potential to persuade and influence a mass audience, drama often functions as a mode of expressing an author's political views: "And there can be no doubt that the theatre—and drama in its wider connotation which extends to the cinema and the electronic mass media—is a powerful political weapon (Esslin, *Anatomy* 95). Even though Miller's ideological differences with the Committee propelled him into the political arena, the rhetorical strategies Miller employed in the construction of his plays were not necessarily conscious creations designed as "political weapons" or as a call to action. The rhetorical elements in *View* and *Crucible* may have been unconscious constructs on Miller's part. These elements, whatever the author's intent, are present in the plays, prompting the belief that Miller was striving for persuasive goals. The persuasive element of a playwright's efforts is discussed by Moffett, who states, "One reason an author works in the dramatic medium is that he wants the deeds he has invented to hit us at the same 'gut' level that actualities do" (62).

The "actualities" for Miller were the traumatic ramifications brought on by the HUAC hearings; drama allowed Miller to convey the injustice he witnessed to his audience, people who knew of the hearings from the media yet who might not

understand the pain inflicted on the artistic community. Hence the dramatic medium allowed theatergoers to internalize Miller's message:

Although the action that takes place in a theater has been premeditated, it has fundamentally the same impact on the spectators as real-life events. True, knowing that the events are artifactual, not actual, gives the spectator a different mental set and alters somewhat his responses, but in viewing both, the spectator is coding events directly for himself; he is looking on, not hearing about. (Moffett 61)

The goal of my thesis is to determine how Miller manipulated the inherent rhetorical nature of drama to induce pathos in his audience, as well as to exemplify the risks and consequences of conforming to authority, which, in this context, is accomplished through the act of being an informant. The body of this study will focus on a rhetorical analysis of both *A View from the Bridge* and *The Crucible* to see how Miller used language to communicate and ultimately to sway public opinion against McCarthy's political machine. The rhetorical elements within each play will be examined chronologically in order to establish patterns and to ascertain how the rhetorical strategies interact and build upon one another for dramatic effect. Although the two-act version of *A View from the Bridge* was staged several years after *The Crucible*, I will examine these plays in reverse chronological order to study the dramas in a linear fashion based on each play's subject matter—*View*, denoting events that may possess an individual to inform on another, then *Crucible*, focusing on the devastation following such an act of betrayal.

I will examine the text of these plays in order to see how Miller's rhetorical choices guide the communicative elements employed on stage:

... the special qualities of writing are best understood when seen as changes in diction, phrasing, sentence structure, and organization made, precisely, in order to adjust to the loss of vocal and facial expression, gesticulation, feedback collaboration and the other characteristics of conversation. (Moffett 117)

Within the text, I will examine Miller's use of repetition, which, as Harrington states, "is one of the most common rhetorical techniques and works both to

emphasize a point and as an element of organizational continuity” (118). I will also study Miller’s syntax, primarily in relation to sentence length, to show how Miller creates a sense of rhythm and motion, often increasing levels of apprehension in his audience. Miller’s diction plays a key role in my analysis, primarily because the connotative associations of his word choice and the basic considerations of theater audiences of the 1950s. Diction is an important rhetorical strategy because most words carry emotional overtones, and writers and speakers use these for rhetorical ends” (Harrington 145); therefore, I will point out jargon and idioms unique to the HUAC hearings that surface literally or metaphorically within each play.

Miller’s stage directions, including the instructional implications in his punctuation, will also be examined for their communicative value. Miller’s stage directions and punctuation serve to guide the actors’ interpretation of the text. The resulting theatrical performance offers both sight and sound cues that evoke an emotional response from the audience: “The sensory apprehension of literature extends and deepens understanding for it relies on very basic rhetorical techniques relating speaker or actor to audience” (Harrington 155).

Studying the assorted rhetorical elements found within the text of *A View from the Bridge* and *The Crucible* is necessary to gaining an understanding of the mechanisms that transform Miller’s written blueprints into the medium of drama. As Moffett notes, drama links words to speakers to motives (116). If Moffett’s statement proves true, this thesis can determine the relationship between Miller’s language and motives as well as suggest how this combination influenced the playwright’s audience against one of the greatest cases of political injustice America has ever witnessed.

CHAPTER TWO

RHETORICAL TECHNIQUES IN *A VIEW FROM THE BRIDGE*

In *Naming Names*, Victor Navasky cites an incident, said to have occurred in 1955, when Arthur Miller allegedly sent a copy of *A View from the Bridge* to Elia Kazan—director of Miller’s prize-winning plays *All My Sons* and *Death of a Salesman*—whose testimony before HUAC severed their working relationship and friendship. Navasky cites the dialogue between the director and playwright:

“I have read your play and would be honored to direct it,” Kazan is supposed to have wired back. “You don’t understand,” Miller replied, “I didn’t send it to you because I wanted you to direct it. I sent it to you because I wanted you to know what I think of stool pigeons.” (199)

Whether or not this exchange actually happened, the animosity Miller felt toward his former collaborator was no secret in the dramatic community. As Navasky states, “. . . after Kazan’s April 1952 testimony before HUAC, Miller and Kazan, once the closest of friends, no longer spoke” (199).

According to Miller, Kazan was not the inspiration for *A View from the Bridge*; in fact, Miller’s original concept for the play dated back to the late 1940s when the playwright was told of an Italian longshoreman who had informed to the Immigration Bureau on his own relatives, two brothers residing illegally in his home, in order to break the engagement of one of the brothers and the longshoreman’s niece. Miller states: “The squealer was disgraced, and no one knew where he had gone off to, and some whispered that he had been murdered by one of the brothers” (*Timebends* 152).

Regardless of Miller’s original inspiration for his play, the presentation of the two-act version of *A View from the Bridge* in 1956—the year Miller was summoned before HUAC and subsequently refused to confirm the Committee’s inquiry regarding the Communist ties of Sue Warren and Arnaud d’Usseau (United States, 84th Cong., 35-36)—features overtones of Miller’s feelings toward informers,

primarily presented via the thematic elements of the play. Eddie (the character based on the longshoreman), having informed on the illegal aliens, Marco and Rodolpho, receives a tragic fate for his actions: he is disgraced by his peers, loses face with both his family and in the community, and is ultimately killed by Marco for his betrayal.

This chapter provides a full analysis of the rhetorical techniques used in Arthur Miller's play *A View from the Bridge*. This approach demonstrates how Miller's rhetorical techniques continually interact to create a sense of pathos in the audience, as well as exemplifies the consequences inherent in the act of informing. The four primary rhetorical strategies being discussed are repetition, diction, syntax, and Miller's use of stage directions. Overtly, for Miller, the price of informing carries a heavy burden; however, Miller's rhetorical techniques probe not into his resentment toward those who "named names," but rather into the psyche of an informer. His rhetorical techniques serve as tools to help his audience investigate what would possess a man with open contempt for informers to eventually jeopardize everything he holds sacred and become an informer himself—an act sure to disgrace himself and his family. In addition, I will juxtapose Miller's rhetorical strategies with parallel events stemming from the HUAC hearings—a situation relevant to Miller's audience during the 1950s.

At the beginning of Act I in *A View from the Bridge*, Miller uses repetition to set up two key elements of the play: Eddie's attraction to his live-in niece, Catherine, and his reluctance to trust people. When Catherine is offered a job as a stenographer, Eddie becomes "strangely nervous" and tries to dissuade her from accepting the job, claiming that her prospective employer is located in a bad neighborhood:

EDDIE, *somehow sickened*, I know that neighborhood, B.[Beatrice], I don't like it.

BEATRICE: Listen, if nothin' happened to her in this neighborhood it ain't gonna happen noplase else. *She turns his face to her.* Look, you

gotta get used to it, she's no baby no more. Tell her to take it. *He turns his head away.* You hear me? *She is angering.* I don't understand you; she's seventeen years old, you gonna keep her in the house all her life?

EDDIE, *insulted*: What kinda remark is that?

BEATRICE, *with sympathy but insistent force*: Well, I don't understand when it ends. First it was gonna be when she graduated high school, so she graduated high school. Then it was gonna be when she learned stenographer, so she learned stenographer. So what're we gonna wait for now? I mean it, Eddie, sometimes I don't understand you; they picked her out of the whole class, it's an honor for her. (13-14)

In her dialogue, Eddie's wife, Beatrice, expresses her frustration toward Eddie's reluctance to let Catherine accept the job. Beatrice repeatedly states that she "don't understand" Eddie's motivations and wonders if he is going to "keep her [Catherine] in the house all of her life." Miller's diction and syntactical repetition in Beatrice's dialogue indicates that the subject of her discourse with Eddie has been an ongoing topic at the Carbone household. Beatrice follows her query to Eddie by listing Catherine's accomplishments, each of which is met by Eddie's excuses to keep his niece at home. Beatrice implies that Catherine's departure will occur when she "graduated high school" and "learned stenographer," each repeated for emphasis. The repetition of "gonna be when she" followed by the repetition of "so she" emphasizes that Catherine aspired to meet a goal, has subsequently met the goal, yet her achievements are not enough to persuade Eddie to let Catherine realize her potential as an adult, i.e., move away from home. "So what're we going to wait for now" suggests that Eddie's reluctance goes beyond normal concern for a relative and borders on obsessive behavior.

Miller's stage directions reinforce the notion that Eddie's concern with his niece's affairs may be unnatural. Beatrice physically "turns his [Eddie's] face" toward herself, only to have Eddie "turn his head away." Eddie is being confronted with an accusation that he literally cannot face.

When Catherine enters, Eddie shifts the focus of discussion and attempts to lightheartedly discuss his niece's departure from home, as if to prove to Beatrice and

Catherine that he knows this event is inevitable:

EDDIE, *grinning*: Why not? That's life. And you'll come visit on Sundays, then once a month, then Christmas and New Year's, finally.

CATHERINE, *grasping his arm to reassure him and to erase the accusation*: No, please!

EDDIE, *smiling but hurt*: I only ask you one thing—don't trust anybody. You got a good aunt but she's got too big a heart, you learned bad from her. Believe me.

Beatrice soon questions Eddie's logic:

BEATRICE: She likes people. What's wrong with that?

EDDIE: Because most people ain't people. She's goin' to work; plumbers; they'll chew her to pieces if she don't watch out.

To Catherine: Believe me, Katie, the less you trust, the less you be sorry.
(15)

Eddie's repetition of "trust" stresses the importance he places on trust as well as his fear of betrayal. The lexical and syntactic repetition of "the less you trust, the less you be sorry," indicates Eddie's paranoia and also predicts Catherine's eventual heartbreak when her trust is shattered by his betrayal. Also, when Eddie says that "most people ain't people," he implies that humans can exhibit the tendencies of animals, a notion fortified by his statement "they'll chew her to pieces." The accuracy of Eddie's implications is ironic, for he, too, will be labeled an *animal* as the result of his treachery.

Miller uses repetition to probe Eddie's psyche and examine Eddie's feelings about authority and informing. Eddie cautions Beatrice and Catherine about the possible consequences of harboring Beatrice's cousins, Marco and Rodolpho. In responding to Catherine's concern that people will see Marco and Rodolpho coming and going, occurrences that may alert Immigration Officials, Eddie responds by stating the importance of citing ignorance of the situation: "I don't care who sees them goin' in and out as long as you don't see them goin' in and out. And this goes for you too, B. You don't see nothin' and you don't know nothin' (16).

Eddie underscores the importance of sight with his repetition of "see"; he

equates seeing things with knowledge of their existence. Thus, for Eddie, the absence of “seeing” something undesirable absolves him, or anyone else, of any responsibility for the occurrence—it is as if the event never happened. In this case, he is concerned with Marco and Rodolpho “goin’ in and out” in their daily actions. By repeating this phrase, Miller shows that this is no casual concern for Eddie; it is a matter of great importance, not only for himself, but for his wife and niece as well. The repetition shows a man trying to protect his loved ones in the only way he understands: denial. It also conveys a sense of Eddie’s paranoia regarding the consequences of getting caught; hence, rather than facing up to his actions, he would rather “know nothin’” in an attempt to escape retribution by those he sees in authority.

This passage also demonstrates one of the author’s stylistic techniques, mainly how Miller’s diction emphasizes the dialect of the characters. Rather than providing stage directions for the characters’ accents, Miller omits letters from words (“goin’” for “going”; “nothin’” for “nothing”) to offer a sense of the characters’ speech patterns. According to Esslin, stylistic techniques incorporated in the text serve to individualize characters by offering them a personal speech pattern and vocabulary, regional dialect, professional jargon, and the like—all of which he feels are meaning-producing elements of the text (*Field* 81-82).

Miller, an avid researcher, mirrors the vernacular of the waterfront at the time to ensure an accurate portrayal of the characters, as well as to provide a more colloquial tone for the dialogue. In addition, the street language becomes a social parallel to the HUAC hearings. The notoriety of the hearings—which had an elitist feel primarily because of celebrity involvement and publicity—may have given the bulk of American society a false sense of security from the Congressional inquisition. By scripting street language in *A View from the Bridge*, Miller shows that these moral dilemmas can occur at all levels of the social spectrum, from

Hollywood celebrities to waterfront workers.

Eddie is intimidated by the Immigration Bureau, an institution that, for Eddie, connotes a sense of both awe and resentment. He states: "This is the United States government you're playin' with now, this is the Immigration Bureau. If you said it you knew it, if you didn't say it you didn't know it" (17). Eddie's reference to "the United States government" alludes to Miller's situation with HUAC, primarily in the word "playing." *Playing* can have the connotation of a game with stakes that can be won or lost. In addition, games are adversarial by nature; hence, if a person plays with the government, the government is recognized as an opponent: a foe.

This passage also shows Eddie's awe of governmental authority. Whereas Miller infuses the majority of the play's dialogue with contractions which add a more colloquial feel to the dialogue, he chooses to preface Eddie's reference to the United States Government and the Immigration Bureau with the formal introduction, "This is the." This approach shows that for Eddie, and possibly for Miller as well, the government is an opponent not to be taken lightly. Miller's phrasing offers a sense of reverence and respect.

The second sentence in this passage is a semantic and syntactic parallel to Eddie's earlier statement that equates seeing nothing with knowing nothing; however, in this case, Miller refers to auditory ignorance verses the visual ignorance stressed in the earlier passage. Again, this passage uses repetition to build a consequential relationship relating sensory acknowledgement with personal accountability. This passage also presents an interesting dichotomy to the testimony process of the HUAC hearings. Those called to testify before HUAC, and who chose to implement their constitutional right not to incriminate themselves under the Fifth Amendment, were thought to be hiding information and were therefore considered uncooperative witnesses, a label with many negative connotations:

For witnesses summoned before the committee, the ordeal was more severe, despite an increase in the use of the Fifth Amendment defense. That defense was no defense in the public's eye. Refusing to answer was

an answer of guilty; and if it kept one out of jail it also led, in many cases, to the loss of one's job. (Willis 27)

Thus, Miller uses Eddie's dialogue to highlight a discrepancy in the belief that keeping one's mouth shut will keep a person out of trouble; in fact, in the days of McCarthyism, the vow of silence could very well condemn a person. Miller elaborates on Eddie's paranoia, and adherence to denial, in the following passage:

I don't care what question it is. You—don't—know—nothin'. They got stool pigeons all over this neighborhood they're payin' them every week for information, and you don't know who they are. It could be your best friend. You hear? (17)

Here Miller, once again, repeats the sentence, "You don't know nothin'"; however, he now separates each word with dashes. According to Shaw, "A dash lends a certain air of surprise or emotional tone on occasion and, if used sparingly, is a useful device for adding movement, or a sense of movement, to writing" (83). Dashes create a pause between words that emphasize Eddie's warning to his family; the dashes add forcefulness to Eddie's statement, offering the feeling of a command and drama.

This passage is also important because Eddie proposes justification for maintaining silence: he fears local informers. Variations of the pronoun "they" are repeated three times in the second sentence, all contributing to define Eddie's growing paranoia. The first "they," as well as "they're," refers to the Immigration Bureau; the final "they" in the sentence is more ambiguous—possibly referring to Immigration yet also incorporating the local informers. The use of "They" also creates a strong *in-group/out-group* feeling. Earl R. Babbie defines an in-group as a group that contributes to a person's social definition and provides support, loyalty, and even affection. He adds:

In-group membership takes on social significance to the extent that the non-members [out-group] belong to distinct groups of their own, groups that are in some degree of competition with yours. An in-group is composed of people you refer to as 'we'; an out-group is made up of people you call 'they.' (203)

Miller is using this passage to explore the social dynamics of Eddie's world; Eddie is a reflection of his community and is concerned about how he looks in the eyes of his peers. The government, in the form of the Immigration Bureau, is a threat to the social harmony of the community. This in-group/out-group motif is solidified by the use of "you" in the passage. Eddie's mention of "You" in the sentence "You don't know who they are" literally seems to be referring to Beatrice and Catherine, yet, figuratively, also to anyone in the neighborhood who is not involved with the Immigration Bureau, anyone who belongs to Eddie's "in-group."

The in-group/out group motif also applies to Miller's involvement in the HUAC hearings. As for the "out-group," HUAC could be substituted for the Immigration Bureau as the threatening governmental agency. Conversely, the in-group for Miller was not only the artistic community, but anyone under fire by the House Committee, including accused members of "government, labor, education, entertainment, and the intellectual community" (Miller, *Essays* 294). As in Eddie's case, the out-group poses a threat to the community—which in Miller's realm is far more diverse and widespread. Miller, through Eddie's dialogue, appears to be advocating unity within the in-group, for, without unity, the group will eventually face the consequences of their complacency.

Miller addresses the notion of the actual informer in the next sentence in which an informer is referred to as "It." The pronoun, "It," although grammatically acceptable, implies an impersonal impression of informers, as if they are too despicable to be called by name; Miller addresses informers either in an impersonal fashion or with derogatory slang terms such as "stool pigeons."

Miller's diction clearly paints a negative picture of the informer, especially since the terminology of the day was so subjective, based entirely on what position one took regarding the hearings. HUAC supporters considered informers to be "patriot[s]," or "courageous" or "friendly"—those who, as J. Edgar Hoover noted,

“fulfill their obligation of citizenship by reporting known facts of the evil conspiracy to properly constituted authorities” (qtd. in Navasky xviii). However, many individuals, like Miller, felt informing on another person was an unforgivable act of betrayal—from this position, informers were known as “stoolies” and “belly-crawlers” (Navasky xvii). Miller’s diction in this passage shows the protagonist’s, i.e., a working man’s view of an informer.

Eddie goes on to describe the plight of a local boy, Vinny, who had informed on an uncle whom Vinny’s family was harboring. This comment results in an interchange between Eddie and Catherine:

CATHERINE: The kid snitched?

EDDIE: On his own uncle!

CATHERINE: What, was he crazy?

EDDIE: He was crazy after, I tell you that, boy. (17)

In this interchange, Miller provides a series of short sentences that offer a sense of urgency regarding the subject matter of the discourse. Catherine’s questions imply that she does not believe Eddie’s story; her dialogue indicates that a family member would not *snitch* on another family member. Catherine’s questions also are related to one another; hence, if the kid “snitched” on a family member, he must be crazy. Eddie’s exclamation also adds to the sense of disbelief about Vinny’s actions. Eddie’s statement “On his own uncle!” not only affirms her question, but also implies the horror of family betrayal. His second statement, primarily with the repetition of “crazy,” establishes a relationship between informing and a person’s sanity—that becoming crazy is a consequence of such a betrayal.

On page 18, Eddie addresses Beatrice’s question about Vinny’s whereabouts and replies:

Him? You’ll never see him no more, a guy do a thing like that?

How’s he gonna show his face? *To Catherine, as he gets up uneasily.*

Just remember, kid, you can quicker get back a million dollars that was stole than a word that you gave away.

In this passage, Eddie answers Beatrice’s question about Vinny with more

questions—a progression of questions that note the severity of Vinny’s offense. Estimating the consequences of Vinny’s fate is beyond Eddie, so what Eddie cannot answer, he responds to with rhetorical questions. This tactic serves as a bid for agreement rather than as a sincere question (Grambs 277). Interestingly, the second question Eddie asks is indirect in nature and should not end with a question mark. By including this punctuation, Miller seems to be forcing a questioning tone to the clause, making it in essence: *how can* a guy do a thing like that? This question mirrors Catherine’s earlier question about Vinny (17), because neither Eddie nor Catherine, at this point in the play, can comprehend one family member’s informing on another.

Miller’s diction in the second half of this passage also reinforces aspects of Eddie’s character. The word “kid,” often used throughout the play when Eddie addresses Catherine, elevates Eddie’s stature in relation to his niece; Eddie appears to be in authority; hence he is in a position to offer advice, which shows the importance he places on words. He equates a single word with a “million dollars,” a large amount of money for a man of Eddie’s means. Miller also compares the notion of having something stolen with giving something away. Eddie purports that unjustly giving something away—since it is an act one does willingly—is not only more damaging, but also more difficult to retrieve than something stolen, even a “million dollars.”

On page 20, Marco, “a square-built peasant of thirty-two,” and his younger brother, Rodolpho, are introduced. Rodolpho is described as a fair-skinned young man with blond hair and a handsome face (22-25). Miller soon establishes that Rodolpho has a good singing voice. The young man is persuaded by an enthusiastic Catherine to sing a version of the song *Paper Doll* but is cut off by Eddie:

EDDIE: Hey, kid—hey, wait a minute—
CATHERINE, *enthralled*: Leave him finish, it’s beautiful! *To Beatrice*:
He’s terrific! It’s terrific, Rodolpho.

EDDIE: Look, kid; you don't want to be picked up, do ya?

MARCO: No—no! *He rises.*

EDDIE, *indicating the rest of the building*: Because we never had no singers here . . . and all of a sudden there's a singer in the house, y'know what I mean?

MARCO: Yes, yes. You'll be quiet, Rodolpho.

EDDIE—*he is flushed*: They got guys all over the place, Marco. I mean.

MARCO: Yes. He'll be quiet. *To Rodolpho*: You'll be quiet.

Rodolpho nods.

Eddie has risen, with iron control, even a smile. (28)

This passage provides examples of repetition, as well as semantic implications of Miller's diction, beginning with the repetition of "kid"; however, this time, Eddie is addressing Rodolpho, not Catherine. The repetition of *kid*, once again, gives Eddie an air of authority, a man in a position to offer advice. By addressing Rodolpho in this fashion, Eddie also groups Rodolpho with Catherine. To Eddie, they are both kids who do not know better. The word *kid* also offers a distinction to Eddie, who obviously is an adult. In essence, the unification between Catherine and Rodolpho foreshadows their eventual attraction for one another and also distances Eddie from his niece.

Perhaps the most symbolic element of this passage is the notion of a "singer." By making Rodolpho a singer, Miller is able to explore the semantic implications of the word *sing*. In a literal sense, the notion of "singer" is perfectly acceptable: Rodolpho is a tenor, and judging from Catherine's reaction to his talents, a good one. However, according to *Webster's New World Dictionary*, the slang version of *sing* is cited as "to confess a crime, esp. implicating others" (557). Eddie's statement works on two distinct levels: literally, a singer is residing in the house—Rodolpho, the tenor. However, looking at "singer" metaphorically, Eddie is prognosticating his own position in the building—he becomes the "singer" in the guise of an informer. Silencing Rodolpho early in the play provides a contrast to Eddie's hypocritical actions as the play progresses. Ironically, Eddie convinces Rodolpho to "be quiet" by implying the presence of the authorities: "They got guys

all over the place.” Here Miller repeats the notion of “They” (17) as an out-group that poses a threat to Eddie and his family.

A passage that seems to parallel issues pertaining to the HUAC hearings is offered by the play’s narrator, Mr. Alfieri, a local lawyer whom Eddie respects:

Who can ever know what will be discovered? Eddie Carbone had never expected to have a destiny. A man works, raises his family, goes bowling, eats, gets old, and then he dies. Now as the weeks passed, there was a future, there was a trouble that would not go away. (29)

Alfieri’s first sentence acts as not only a question, but as a warning. It suggests that a person’s past is never truly forgotten and incidents or feelings, thought long since passed, may yet resurface to cause “trouble.” This notion is indicative of many of those called before HUAC. As Garry Willis states in his introduction to *Scoundrel Days* by Lillian Hellman:

... everyone must henceforth watch his or her contacts, where one went, whom one saw—a gregarious misstep into the wrong meeting, a check signed for some charitable cause, a more than casual acquaintance with radicals, could put you on the list and forbid you a job. (10)

Miller, in his appearance before HUAC, was reminded of his past affiliations with “radical” organizations, some of these ties occurring over a decade before he was summoned to testify. “Well, I had made a lot of statements and I had signed a great many petitions,” Miller states, “I’d been involved in organizations, you know, putting my name down for fifteen years before that” (Carlisle and Styron 227).

Miller elaborates on this theme in his testimony before the Committee regarding a Marxist study course he attended briefly in 1940: “This [study group] is 16 years ago. That is half a lifetime away. I don’t recall and I haven’t been able to recall and, if I could, I would tell you the exact nature of that application” (United States, 84th Cong., 33). Miller uses Alfieri’s question to make the audience query their own past, not that Miller feels the past can be altered, nor does he imply people should forsake what is important during the present to avoid difficulties in the future; he simply acknowledges that the latent portions of our lives may, through some quirk

of fate, be *discovered*—even the secrets of a simple working man like Eddie Carbone.

The third sentence in the passage on page 29 presents a gloomy depiction of the human condition, neatly summed up in 15 words. The series of two/three word clauses used to describe the life of a working man poses a feeling of insignificance—a feeling further enhanced by the syntax of the sentence. Miller sets up this string of life events sequentially; however, where one expects a chronological order, the playwright offers a haphazard listing where “bowling” is equal to eating or raising a family. This meager summation of a person’s life establishes pathos, allowing the audience to view Eddie (and perhaps “man” in general) as tragic. In addition, this sentence illuminates the fact that even the most ordinary of individuals can be thrown into extraordinary situations and must eventually face his or her “destiny.”

The issue of *singing* resurfaces in a conversation between Eddie and Beatrice, when Eddie expresses his concern with Rodolpho’s habit of singing on-board the ships they work on:

EDDIE: Just what I said, he sings. Right on the deck, all of a sudden, a whole song come out of his mouth—with motions. You know what they’re callin’ him now? Paper Doll they’re callin’ him, Canary. He’s like a weird. He comes out on the pier, one-two-three, it’s a regular free show.

BEATRICE: Well, he’s a kid; he don’t know how to behave himself yet.

EDDIE: And with that wacky hair; he’s like a chorus girl or sump’m.

BEATRICE: So he’s blond, so—

EDDIE: I just hope that’s his regular hair, that’s all I hope.

BEATRICE: You crazy or sump’m? *She tries to turn him to her.*

EDDIE—*he keeps his head turned away*: What’s so crazy? I don’t like his whole way. (30-31)

As with the passage on page 28, Miller emphasizes Eddie’s concern with Rodolpho’s *singing*. The dialogue takes this issue to another level, showing less concern with Rodolpho’s singing than with the reaction of the other dock workers toward Eddie’s cousin. The repetition of “they’re callin’ him,” details Eddie’s

concern with appearances and the opinions of his peers. Rodolpho's songs are no longer the main issue, but rather that Rodolpho, being a member of Eddie's family, is drawing attention to Eddie himself; Eddie sees a negative reflection on Rodolpho's character as a negative reflection on his own being. Eddie's perceptions regarding Rodolpho's actions are inaccurate for the other longshoremen seem to like Rodolpho. Therefore, Rodolpho's singing is not a threat to Eddie; Eddie is threatened by Rodolpho's budding romance with Catherine. Eddie's diction—by alluding to Rodolpho's singing, "wacky hair," and other character traits—allows him to address his own sexual insecurities in the guise of bringing Rodolpho's masculinity into question.

The notion of "kid" also resurfaces in this passage, yet the understanding stemming from an authority figure is transferred from Eddie to Beatrice. Eddie's wife, in the fashion Eddie used earlier in the play, justifies Rodolpho's *immature* actions on the basis of his youth. By this point in the play, Eddie's thoughts are clouded by his own ambiguous feelings toward Catherine. For Eddie, that Rodolpho is merely "a kid," no longer matters; Rodolpho is now a rival for Catherine's affections. Miller's diction, once again, references the issue of the informer. Eddie is upset that Rodolpho is being called "Canary." At a literal level, "Canary," a songbird, is an appropriate nickname for the tenor, Rodolpho, yet "Canary" is also associated with the act of informing: "A police elab.[sic] is *sing like a canary*" (qtd. in Beale 404). Eddie's disgust at the term illustrates his displaced feelings regarding his brewing thoughts of betrayal.

This passage, through Eddie's dialogue, shows discontinuity in his thought process. The characters equate betrayal with being "crazy." Although Eddie has not actually betrayed anyone yet, he is pressured by the confusing situation he finds himself in; this confusion is brought out in Eddie's dialogue. That Eddie both asks and answers a question in two consecutive sentences, as well as repeats "they're

callin' him" in the fourth sentence, gives his dialogue a rambling feeling, a sense he is defending his implications. In addition, the final two sentences of his first statement create a sense of synchysis, which Grambs cites as "deliberately jumbled word order to indicate a confused state of mind" (404). By adding the article "a" in the fifth sentence, Miller shows Eddie to be verbalizing thoughts and feelings that he cannot fully articulate. The inclusion of "a" in the fifth sentence blurs Eddie's actual meaning. Eddie could have eliminated "like a" and simply stated "He's weird." Conversely, the noun "person" could have been added to the end of the sentence to complete the thought. However, Miller's ultimate syntax successfully jumbles the two thoughts to highlight Eddie's current state of mind. Miller further illustrates this in the sixth sentence by adding the words "one-two-three" in the middle of the sentence. This phrasing shows Eddie's futile attempt to prove his point to Beatrice, but his verbal ploy does not work; his line of reasoning makes her query if he is "crazy or sump'm." At a verbal level, Eddie, lost in his quest to discredit his rival, sees no problem with his logic: since Eddie dislikes Rodolpho's "whole way," his thoughts are not crazy. However, the verbal reference is overshadowed by Miller's stage directions in which Eddie, once again, cannot face his wife while making his statement, even after she physically tries to make him look at her. These actions imply that Eddie does not believe what he is saying.

The dynamics of Eddie's moral dilemma are fully realized during his conversation with Mr. Alfieri near the end of the first act. In this scene, Eddie lists a series of Rodolpho's attributes, including the young man's hair color, weight, and singing in order to show Alfieri that Rodolpho "ain't right":

EDDIE *takes a breath and glances briefly over each shoulder.*

The guy [Rodolpho] ain't right, Mr. Alfieri.

ALFIERI: What do you mean?

EDDIE: I mean he ain't right.

ALFIERI: I don't get you.

EDDIE *shifts to another position in the chair*: Dja ever get a look at him?

ALFIERI: Not that I know of, no.

EDDIE: He's a blond guy. Like . . . platinum. You know that I mean?

ALFIERI: No.

EDDIE: I mean if you close the paper fast—you could blow him over.

ALFIERI: Well that doesn't mean—

EDDIE: Wait a minute, I'm tellin' you sump'm He sings, see.

Which is—I mean it's all right, but sometimes he hits a note, see.

I turn around. I mean—high. You know what I mean? (43-44)

This series of short questions and answers shows Eddie's desperate search for agreement with his assertions. With each question, Eddie throws out a reason for Alfieri to disapprove of Rodolpho, and when approval of his assertions is not immediate, Eddie instantly shifts focus to another reason, without any attempt to justify the prior assertion. By shifting the focus in this manner, Miller showcases the shallow nature of Eddie's charges; Eddie offers no substantial reasons why anybody should dislike Rodolpho.

The abruptness of Alfieri's answers add a sense of motion to the dialogue. As their discourse continues, Eddie senses by Alfieri's reaction that he is not communicating his point. Miller emphasizes this with the repetition of the word "mean" and the question, "You know what I mean?" This repetition also demonstrates Eddie's insecurities about his own assertions; Eddie appears to validate his own accusations by convincing Alfieri, or Beatrice, or anyone else of Rodolpho's flaws. Unfortunately for Eddie, his assertions do not work any better with Alfieri than they did with Beatrice on pages 30-31—in fact, Eddie is so entwined in his emotions that he cannot recognize that his *problem* with Rodolpho stems from purely selfish reasons.

Miller's stage directions also offer a sense that Eddie's actions are disreputable. When Eddie "glances briefly over each shoulder" in the first line, he is exhibiting suspicious characteristics by assuring himself that nobody else can hear what he is about to say. Similarly, by having Eddie shift to another position in his chair, Miller establishes the longshoreman's uneasiness, primarily since Eddie is not getting the response he wants from Alfieri. Esslin states that body language, as offered by

Miller's stage directions, is a useful way to guide the audiences' interpretation of the text:

'Body language' from the most spectacular posture down to the most minute flicker of the eyelids is among the most primitive of all communication media, one that human beings share with the higher animals; it evokes many almost totally instinctive, automatic responses. (Field 66)

By incorporating body language in his stage directions, Miller demonstrates the forbidding elements involved in *setting up* another individual.

On page 44, Eddie's innuendoes regarding Rodolpho's homosexuality become more explicit:

Couple of nights ago my niece brings out a dress which it's too small for her, because she shot up like a light this last year. He [Rodolpho] takes the dress, lays it on the table, he cuts it up; one-two-three, he makes a new dress. I mean he looked so sweet there, like an angel—you could kiss him he was so sweet.

Eddie's repetition of "dress" stresses his concern with a man having feminine attributes. Eddie's diction about his cousin's ability to make a dress for Catherine, indicates that Rodolpho is effeminate: the young man is "sweet" and "like an angel." Because Eddie is talking to a man, Alfieri, his statement "you could kiss him he was so sweet" implies that, because of Rodolpho's feminine qualities, a male could be attracted to him. According to Carson, the issue of homosexuality becomes a ploy by Eddie to abort Catherine's attraction to Rodolpho: "Unable to admit the true nature of his feeling for Catherine, Eddie converts his jealousy of Rodolpho into a conviction that he is a homosexual and only interested in Catherine as a means of obtaining American citizenship" (82). Eddie's reference to Rodolpho's homosexuality is two-fold: since Eddie views his cousin as feminine, possibly homosexual, Rodolpho cannot be an acceptable suitor for Catherine. Also that Eddie states Rodolpho is so sweet "you could just kiss him" (which Eddie actualizes in Act II in a drunken, yet useless, attempt to embarrass his cousin before Catherine)

brings Eddie's own sexuality into question: just as he has a latent attraction for his young niece, he may also have a latent attraction to Rodolpho—an affinity that may add further confusion to Eddie's already ambiguous sexual inclinations. Ironically, if he is attracted to Rodolpho, Eddie, by his own definition, is unsuitable for Catherine.

Eddie then offers other indications of his troubles with Rodolpho, at first with superficial concerns:

EDDIE: Mr. Alfieri, they're laughin' at him on the pier.
I'm ashamed. Paper Doll they call him. Blondie now. . . .

Eddie eventually affirms the true issue at hand:

But I know what they're laughin' at, and when I think of that guy layin' his hands on her I could—I mean it's eatin' me out, Mr. Alfieri, because I struggled for that girl. (44)

As earlier in the play, Eddie voices his concerns about Rodolpho's attributes. And, to some degree, he is truly upset with Rodolpho's nicknames such as "Paper Doll" or "Blonde," for the approval of Eddie's peers is very important to him. However, in the second passage, Eddie shifts to the issue troubling him—Rodolpho's relationship with Catherine. Miller's diction in this passage illustrates the intensity of Eddie's emotions. Eddie cannot even refer to Rodolpho by name; Eddie's cousin is reduced to "that guy." Also, the term "layin' his hands on her" discredits Rodolpho's intentions. Rodolpho truly does care for Catherine, yet Eddie implies that his cousin's advances are purely sexual; Eddie's dialogue about Rodolpho's amorous intentions for Catherine contradicts his earlier allusion to the young man's homosexuality. "I could" adds a threatening tone to Eddie's statement that, in this context, would normally be followed with malicious intentions, i.e., *I could just kill him!* However, Eddie stops himself before an actual threat is made and in turn describes the personal toll he is feeling with "it's eatin' me out." This phrase depicts a condition that goes far beyond simple unease; Eddie's circumstance is physically

destroying him, as a cancer might—he is approaching the breaking point.

Miller addresses the issue of informing in the following passage when Eddie and Alfieri discuss possible legal solutions to Eddie's dilemma:

ALFIERI: . . . There's only one legal question here.

EDDIE: What?

ALFIERI: The manner in which they entered the country. But I don't think you want to do anything about that do you?

EDDIE: You mean—?

ALFIERI: Well, they entered illegally.

EDDIE: Oh, Jesus, no, I wouldn't do nothin' about that, I mean—

ALFIERI: All right, then, let me talk now, eh? (45)

What is noteworthy about this section of dialogue is that the entire issue of Eddie's informing the Immigration Authorities is implied but never addressed directly. Alfieri suggests that because Marco and Rodolpho are illegal aliens, Eddie's only legal recourse may be to inform on his cousins in order to sever the relationship between Rodolpho and Catherine. Yet Alfieri immediately counters his statement with a question designed to seek Eddie's assurance that he will not pursue the issue with the authorities. Eddie seeks verification of Alfieri's implications with the question "You mean—?" By structuring the dialogue in this fashion, Miller presents the act of informing as so horrific and taboo that it cannot be discussed by name. The avoidance noted in the discourse between Eddie and Alfieri serves as a subtext in the play:

The characters themselves, particularly in post-Chekhovian drama, may well rarely say what they really mean simply because people in real life frequently avoid being too direct, and interpersonal problems are only rarely solved by talking about them. (*Field* 86)

Instead of addressing the subtext of informing directly, Eddie's reply, "Oh, Jesus, no," primarily because of its religious reference to "Jesus," highlights Eddie's shock that Alfieri can even imply such a terrible thing—Eddie denies the possibility of his informing not only to Alfieri, but to ethereal beings as well.

Another critical passage occurs on page 46, as Eddie verbalizes his options,

and frustrations, to Alfieri:

EDDIE, *with a helpless but ironic gesture*: What can I do? I'm a patsy, what can a patsy do? I worked like a dog twenty years so a punk could have her, so that's what I done. I mean, in the worst times, in the worst, when there wasn't a ship comin' in the harbor, I didn't stand around lookin' for relief—I hustled. When there was empty piers in Brooklyn I went to Hoboken, Staten Island, The West Side, Jersey, all over—because I made a promise. I took out of my own mouth to give to her. I took out of my wife's mouth. I walked hungry plenty days in this city. *It begins to break through*. And now I gotta sit in my own house and look at a son-of-a-bitch punk like that—which he came out of nowhere! I give him my house to sleep! I take the blankets off my bed for him, and he takes and puts his dirty filthy hands on her like a goddam thief!

ALFIERI, *rising*: But, Eddie, she's a woman now.

EDDIE: He's stealing from me!

ALFIERI: She wants to get married, Eddie. She can't marry you, can she?

EDDIE, *furiously*: What're you talkin' about, marry me! I don't know what the hell you're talkin' about!

As noted in Miller's initial stage direction, this passage shows Eddie's desperation—he feels helpless and trapped. In his downtrodden state, Eddie's first question, "What can I do?" is presented as more rhetorical than a request for Alfieri's advice. Eddie does not expect a response to his query, nor does he give Alfieri time to reply. Instead Eddie acknowledges that despite his efforts, he cannot change his circumstance. Eddie views this helplessness as punishment for being too good-natured, hence being a "patsy." These questions basically amount to a syllogism: a patsy is too easily taken advantage of to act in his or her own best interest; Eddie considers himself a patsy, so Eddie cannot rectify his situation.

As the passage continues, Miller demonstrates Eddie's sacrifice, determination, and loyalty. Here Miller portrays Eddie as a man who does what is necessary to survive. If Eddie is desperate, he "hustles." By listing a quick succession of locations in which Eddie sought work, "Hoboken, Staten Island, the West Side, Jersey, all over," Miller showcases Eddie's determination and loyalty—Eddie's family will not go hungry. The question is whether Eddie's *protective* actions in

regard to Catherine's desires are truly benefiting anybody. Catherine's marriage to Rodolpho would end Eddie's obligation to her; hence, he would no longer have to take food out "of his own mouth" or his "wife's mouth." His niece's nuptials would also end Eddie's obligation to Rodolpho, whom Eddie now regrets offering refuge to as noted in "I give him my house to sleep! I take the blankets off my bed for him." In essence, if Catherine and Rodolpho left, Eddie would no longer be a patsy. Although Catherine's marriage would end Eddie's obligations, her departure would sever his relationship and emotional attraction to her. Eddie seemingly is playing the martyr, yet Miller makes his audience question Eddie's true motivations.

Despite of the barrage of reasons he cites for breaking up Catherine and Rodolpho, Eddie is trying to sustain his own relationship, and attraction, to Catherine; this is the main reason Eddie cannot stand the thought of Rodolpho getting "his dirty filthy hands" on Catherine. As seen before in Eddie's character, he projects his inner confusion onto a physical attribute of Rodolpho in order to assign blame and refocus his own sense of guilt. Since Eddie and Rodolpho share the same occupation, Rodolpho's hands would be no cleaner or dirtier than Eddie's. Thus, the adjectives "dirty filthy" refer not to Rodolpho, but to Eddie's hidden desire for his niece. Alternative meanings for "dirty" include "soil," and "obscenity," both of which apply to the incestuous overtones dictating Eddie's actions in the play—overtones further implied by the emotional and physical distance between Eddie and Beatrice¹.

Conversely, Miller uses this passage to bestow a sense of sympathy for Eddie. This pathos stems from Eddie's struggle to obtain work as well as his feelings of an impending loss—that Catherine is being *stolen* from him. Miller's descriptions of Eddie's hardship make the longshoreman appear reputable: Eddie has given of himself to help others, and he has kept his promise to Catherine's now-deceased mother. However, Eddie's latent feelings for Catherine have psychologically backed

him into a corner. This passage also shows an intensification of Eddie's hatred toward Rodolpho. On page 44, Eddie refers to Rodolpho as "that guy." In this passage, Eddie initially calls Rodolpho "a punk" and, as Eddie becomes more irritated by his dilemma, changes his reference of Rodolpho to "a son-of-a-bitch punk," then finally "a goddam thief!" Eddie, by focusing his rage on Rodolpho, gradually builds a case against his cousin, the "thief" who is "stealing" Catherine away. Eddie's reasoning justifies his eventual betrayal of Rodolpho: Eddie must protect his niece.

Alfieri addresses the relationship between Eddie and Catherine with his question "She can't marry you, can she?" This query incites Eddie's anger, yet his denial of Alfieri's implication appears legitimate. When Eddie states "What're you talkin' about," and "I don't know what the hell you're talkin' about," he is, on the surface, denying comprehension of Alfieri's question while psychologically denying his repressed feelings to himself; Eddie cannot handle the realization of his latent passion for Catherine. According to McConnell, psychological denial is "A defense mechanism in which reality is denied, or a threatening input is blocked from consciousness" (568). Eddie's dialogue explicitly implies a lack of comprehension yet, according to Esslin, a character's dialogue cannot be taken at "face-value":

Nor can any words spoken by a character in drama thus be taken at their face-value. They are always the product of the character, the character's motivations and the situation in which he finds himself. The audience is constantly compelled to question these motivations and to subject them to continuous analysis in the light of the developing situations. An assertion that is made can be proved or discredited by subsequent events. (*Field* 85)

By denying comprehension of Alfieri's question, Eddie is actually denying his impulse to win the affections of his niece, an act generally taboo in American culture. However, Eddie's unconscious passions surface in his conscious efforts to hurt Rodolpho. Miller's portrayal of Eddie delves into the psychological territory of Reaction Formation and Projection, in which "the ego changes unacceptable love [of

Catherine] into acceptable hate [of Rodolpho]" (McConnell 568). Miller—through Eddie's increasingly volatile diction, rambling dialogue, and fragmented syntax—emphasizes Eddie's psychosis with these rhetorical devices so that Eddie can legitimize his eventual betrayal of Marco and Rodolpho.

Eddie brings up what he considers Rodolpho's effeminate characteristics at the close of Act I in another attempt to show Catherine of his cousin's inadequacies as well as argue why Rodolpho should relocate:

EDDIE: It's wonderful. He sings, he cooks, he could make dresses . . .
CATHERINE: They get some high pay, them guys. The head chefs in all the big hotels are men. You read about them.
EDDIE: That's what I'm sayin'.

Eddie elaborates his argument:

I mean like me—I can't cook, I can't sing, I can't make dresses, so I'm on the water front. But if I could cook, if I could sing, if I could make dresses, I wouldn't be on the water front . . . I would be someplace else. I would be like in a dress store. *He has bent the rolled paper and it suddenly tears in two. He suddenly gets up and pulls his pants up over his belly and goes to Marco.* What do you say, Marco, we go to the bouts next Saturday night. You never seen a fight, did you? (53)

As seen earlier, Eddie uses repetition to question Rodolpho's masculinity and illustrate why he feels Rodolpho should leave the waterfront. The repetition of "sings," "cooks," and "make dresses" highlights the differences between Eddie and Rodolpho. Eddie lacks Rodolpho's talents as seen with the repetition of "can't." Conversely, if Eddie "could" do these things, he would be "someplace else" such as a "dress store," which is exactly what he feels Rodolpho should do—be someplace far away from Catherine. In contrast, Eddie counters Rodolpho's effeminate traits by suggesting the "bouts next Saturday night," obviously a virile activity. As seen earlier, Eddie's allusions to Rodolpho's homosexual tendencies are in vain: "... the irrationality of his accusations, which could have no effect other than to further alienate Catherine, indicate the intensity of the longshoreman's desperation" (Moss 68).

Eddie's plight intensifies in Act II when Catherine and Rodolpho are scheduled to be married. Marriage would immediately make Rodolpho an American citizen, so the young lovers are anxious to be wed. Facing the burden of a tightened timetable, Eddie once again seeks Alfieri's advice, yet this time an ominous tone is in Alfieri's dialogue as the lawyer reflects on his meeting with Eddie: "But I will never forget how dark the room became when he looked at me; his [Eddie's] eyes were like tunnels" (64). Miller's imagery in Alfieri's statement prognosticates Eddie's downfall. According to Vaughn, imagery is used in a dramatic work to appeal to the senses of the reader/audience; this is accomplished by repeated references to sight, sound, or reminders of the physical world (97-98). In this case, Miller's diction describing Eddie's attributes, primarily regarding sight, creates an aura of impending disaster. The adjective "dark" offers many connotations, including "gloomy; threatening," and "evil; sinister" (*American Heritage* 180). These powerful images incited by Eddie's "look," combined with the shadowy hollowness of eyes like "tunnels," portray Eddie as a man turned cold and empty, with a creature-like quality. If one considers the eyes as the windows to the soul, Miller's diction implies that Eddie is now soulless.

Eddie disregards Alfieri's suggestion to "Let her [Catherine] go. And Bless her." At this point, Miller combines stage direction with dialogue to offer a warning about the fate of an informer. Alfieri tries to reason with Eddie, but to no avail:

... A phone booth begins to glow on the opposite side of the stage; a faint, lonely blue. Eddie stands up, jaws clenched. Somebody had to come for her, Eddie, sooner or later. Eddie starts turning to go and Alfieri rises with new anxiety. You won't have a friend in the world, Eddie! Even those who understand will turn against you, even the ones who feel the same will despise you! Eddie moves off. Put it out of your mind! Eddie! He follows into the darkness, calling desperately.

Eddie is gone. The phone is glowing in light now. Light is out on Alfieri. Eddie has at the same time appeared beside the phone. (66)

This passage exhibits similarities to the prior conversation between Eddie and Alfieri (45) when the notion of Eddie's informing on his cousins is first brought up.

Again, the topic of informing is never actually discussed; in fact, Eddie says nothing at all. Yet Alfieri knows Eddie's emotional state and the lawyer's dialogue, combined with the illumination of the telephone booth, alert the audience that Eddie will notify the Immigration Officials of his cousins' whereabouts.

Alfieri's "anxiety" is offered through Miller's use of exclamation points. According to Shaw, exclamation points can be used to "express surprise, emphasis, or strong emotion," or "to express a command or vigorous request" (94-95). Using Shaw's criteria, Alfieri's first two exclamations are used to express strong emotion, offering a verbal representation of Alfieri's anxiety. Alfieri then, sensing what Eddie is about to do, offers a "vigorous request" in an attempt to stop Eddie. The emotional implications of Miller's punctuation serve to guide the actors', as well as the audiences', interpretation of the text:

... a well-written dramatic text can and should already contain and compel the actor's gestures. Brecht's term 'gestural language' points to the interdependence, and sometimes dialectical, contrapuntal relationship between the verbal and the facial or gestural sign systems in drama. (Esslin, *Field* 65-66)

Here Miller uses punctuation to guide the actors' interpretation of the text and subsequently show the audience that Eddie, by informing, is about to commit a loathsome act and Alfieri is desperate in his attempt to stop him before any harm is caused.

By using the word "Even" in the sentence "Even those who understand will turn against you, even the ones who feel the same will despise you!", Miller's diction connotes a natural instinct for people to turn against or despise an informer. In fact, *even* Eddie's allies will turn against him for this action; Eddie will truly be a man alone, much like the "lonely blue phonebooth" Miller describes in his stage directions.

In the following passage, Miller uses a series of short sentences to offer an impersonal view of Eddie as he calls the Immigration Bureau: "I want to report

something. Illegal immigrants. Two of them. That's right. Four-forty-one Saxon Street, Brooklyn, yeah. Ground floor. Heh?" (66). These sentences not only imitate the flow of one being questioned in a conversation, but also offer a rhythmic coldness, a fast-paced drilling that makes Eddie's actions seem mechanical. Eddie's curt responses imply a matter-of-fact tone with no indication of remorse.

Although in the previous passage Eddie shows no regret for his actions, he later has a change of heart and tries to convince Catherine and Beatrice to get Marco and Rodolpho out of the house before the authorities arrive. When Catherine queries Eddie about his request, he responds with a barrage of questions:

Will you stop arguin' with me and get them out! You think I'm always tryin' to fool you or sump'm? What's the matter with you, don't you believe I could think of your good? Did I ever ask sump'm for myself? You think I got no feelin's? I never told you nothin' in my life that wasn't for your good. Nothin'! And look at the way you talk to me! Like I was an enemy! (73)

Miller alternates between exclamations and questions to showcase Eddie's feelings of distress as well as his underlying guilt for his actions, especially toward Catherine. His first sentence functions as a declarative; Eddie knows time is of the essence and therefore orders Catherine to comply with his demand. However, he immediately jumps into a series of questions, stated so quickly that Catherine cannot possibly reply, seemingly an attempt for him to question his own nature. Eddie contradicts himself when he states "I never told you nothin' in my life that wasn't for your good. Nothin'!" In reality, Eddie's actions show little concern for Catherine's best interest and are instead dominated by his own selfish needs. In the final sentences, Miller illustrates Eddie's ability to transfer his own guilt into blame for another's actions. In this case, Eddie has committed the ultimate betrayal, an act that will devastate his niece, yet he blocks out the implications of his act in order to transfer the guilt to Catherine, based on the way she is "talkin" to him. Actually, her questions to Eddie about where to hide Rodolpho and Marco are

legitimate, not antagonistic; Catherine is not talking to Eddie as if he were an “enemy.” Eddie’s conscience affirms that his own acts made him Catherine’s enemy. Eddie is once again using repression as a defense mechanism; he is now repressing his act of informing, just as he has repressed his true feelings for Catherine throughout the play.

Miller’s diction connotes a negative view of an informer, primarily by associating animal imagery with the actions of an informer. Eddie states: “The last year or two I come in the house I don’t know what’s gonna hit me. It’s a shootin’ gallery in here and I’m the pigeon” (69). Being the pigeon indicates that Eddie is in a potentially volatile situation; it is just a matter of time until the pigeon is shot. However, Miller’s “pigeon” reference also reinforces the sentiments Eddie himself expresses toward informers earlier in the play. By calling himself a pigeon, Eddie acknowledges his own capacity for betrayal; he also anticipates his own fate that, in effect, is the unsavory fate of an informer, much like that of the local boy, Vinny.

The rhetorical strategy used in the Alfieri scenes is repeated near the end of the play. In this passage, occurring just after the Immigration Police arrive at Eddie’s residence to pick up Marco and Rodolpho, the question of Eddie’s guilt is established and answered by Beatrice, solely through implication and stage directions:

Eddie turns to Beatrice. She looks at him now and sees his terror.
BEATRICE, *weakened with fear*: Oh, Jesus, Eddie.
EDDIE: What’s the matter with you?
BEATRICE, *pressing her palms against her face*: Oh, my God, my God.
EDDIE: What’re you, accusin me?
BEATRICE—*her final thrust is to turn toward him instead of running from him*: My God, what did you do? (74)

Miller’s stage directions are critical for understanding the discourse between Eddie and Beatrice. Without Beatrice seeing Eddie’s “terror,” she may not have immediately pieced together his guilt. In turn, the physical action of Beatrice pressing her hands against her face denotes surprise or even horror; hence, Beatrice

is shocked by Eddie's actions, even though he has admitted to nothing. As Miller set up the scene, Eddie doesn't need to admit his guilt; it is evident in Beatrice's dialogue. Her first response, "Oh, Jesus, Eddie," has both a pitying and questioning tone. She is not angry at this point, nor does she query his guilt (which is implied), rather her physical demeanor and dialogue take the guise of *how could you do such a thing*; Beatrice's response to Eddie makes him appear pathetic. The religious references in this passage are also used in earlier dialogue between Eddie and Alfieri. Beatrice, by referring to "Jesus" and "God," shows the seriousness of the situation. She seems to ask higher powers how such a horrible thing can happen, and also how her own husband could commit such an act. Miller offers an interesting reversal here in that rather than having Beatrice question Eddie, at least initially, Eddie ends up questioning her. As seen so many times earlier, Eddie, manipulating the situation he created, immediately transposes guilt to another party. His response, "What're you, accusin' me?" connotes the feeling that he is surprised Beatrice is implying his guilt through her actions. Again, Eddie creates the opportunity to express denial.

Near the end of Act II, Eddie is forced to face the consequences of his actions, yet he still manages to refocus the blame to another person, in this case Marco, who rightfully has accused Eddie of informing on him. Eddie responds:

EDDIE: That's the thanks I get? Which I took the blankets off my bed for yiz? You gonna apologize to me, Marco! *Marco!* (76)

Eddie continues on page 76:

Marco is gone. The crowd turned to Eddie.
EDDIE, *to Lipari and wife*: He's crazy! I give them the blankets off my bed. Six months I kept them like my own brothers!

Lipari, the butcher, turns and starts up left with his arm around his wife.

EDDIE: Lipari! *He follows Lipari up left.* For Christ's sake, I kept them, I give them the blankets off my bed! (77).

The repetition of "I give them the blankets off my bed" shows Eddie's attempt to

redeem himself in the eyes of the community. For Eddie, the sacrifice of keeping Rodolpho and Marco is justification for any action he may have committed. Eddie's use of repetition is a tool to try to convince his audience that he is a good person who has given of himself in the past, one who should be praised for his efforts.

As Eddie's friends begin to leave him, he stands there defiantly repeating himself, only this time in the form of rage. He states:

EDDIE: He's [Marco] gonna take that back. He's gonna take that back or I'll kill him! You hear me? I'll kill him! I'll kill him! (77)

Miller's rhetorical devices have Eddie falling back into familiar patterns. Rather than acknowledging his betrayal of Rodolpho and Marco, Eddie shifts the blame to Marco for insulting him. Hence, Marco's response to Eddie's actions comes into question, rather than Eddie's act of betrayal that sets off the chain of events. By repeating the sentence "I'll kill him," Miller shows Eddie's rage. Clearly, Eddie is incensed, but, because of patterns of denial Miller has shown throughout the play, the audience must question what Eddie truly is angry about: Marco's accusations or Eddie's guilt for setting up his cousins in the first place, an act that will ruin both him and his family.

Miller's diction, primarily in animal references and imagery, is emphasized at the conclusion of the play, demonstrated by Catherine's statement to Beatrice:

CATHERINE: How can you listen to him? This rat!
BEATRICE, *shaking Catherine*: Don't you call him that!
CATHERINE, *clearing from Beatrice*: What're you scared of? He's a rat! He belongs in the sewer!
BEATRICE: Stop it!
CATHERINE, *weeping*: He bites people when they sleep! He comes when nobody's lookin' and poisons decent people. In the garbage he belongs! (81)

As with the other animal imagery Miller uses throughout the play, Catherine's declaration that Eddie is "a rat" suggests different interpretations. Catherine's description of Eddie refers heavily to the literal meaning of a rat—a rodent, often

disease-carrying, found in “sewers” and “garbage.” However, like *canaries* and *pigeons*, *rats* are also associated with informing. In fact, *Webster’s New World Dictionary* cites the slang version of *rat* as “a sneaky, contemptible person; esp., an informer” (495). Thus, Miller’s diction describes Eddie, and all informers by default, as rodent-like beings—the lowest of the low.

Miller uses punctuation in this passage to stress the urgency of the situation. As he did earlier to express Alfieri’s “anxiety” over Eddie’s plight, Miller rivets the discourse between Beatrice and Catherine with exclamation marks (seven total) to convey their emotional state to the audience. In this approach, Catherine, feeling betrayed by Eddie, comes across as furious; Beatrice, although abhorred by Eddie’s actions, remains loyal to her husband and defends him against Catherine’s accusations.

The idea of transferring one emotion to another repeats at the end of the play when Marco and Eddie, the betrayed and the betrayer, confront each other. At this point in the play, Eddie is completely out of control; he is “shocked” and “horrified” at Beatrice’s accusations that Eddie desired Catherine all along:

BEATRICE: You want something else, Eddie, and you can never have her!

CATHERINE, *in horror*: B!

EDDIE, *shocked, horrified, his fist clenching*: Beatrice! (83)

Eddie continues:

EDDIE, *crying out in agony*: That’s what you think of me—that I would have such a thought? *His fists clench his head as though it will burst.*

MARCO, *calling near the door outside*: Eddie Carbone! *Eddie swerves about; all stand transfixed for an instant. People appear outside.*

EDDIE, *as though flinging his challenge*: Yeah, Marco! Eddie Carbone. Eddie Carbone. Eddie Carbone. *He goes up the stairs and emerges from the apartment.* (84)

As horrified as Catherine and Eddie are said to be in the stage directions, both seem to know exactly what Beatrice is talking about. And, as seen earlier, Eddie’s desire

is alluded to but never stated directly. Yet even with Beatrice's indirect accusation, the unspeakable has been spoken and Eddie is now cornered; his hidden desires are out in the open. Here the subtext regarding Eddie's lust for Catherine is fully realized by the audience:

It is from the dialectical interplay between the situation as it has developed from the chain of previous situations, on the one hand, and the words that *are* spoken, on the other, that the underlying unspoken thoughts and emotions of the characters—the subtext—ultimately emerge for the attentive and perceptive spectator who has often instinctively mastered the art of decoding such a subtle interplay of signs. (Esslin, *Field* 86)

By stating that Eddie “can’t have her” [Catherine], Beatrice affirms her hidden knowledge, and fear, that Eddie is romantically attracted to his niece—a desire that has been addressed, but never confronted, throughout the play.

Miller's stage directions are critical to this passage because they set up the inevitable confrontation between Eddie and Marco. Eddie's clenched fist shows his rage; he is ready to explode and simply needs a vehicle in which to vent his anger: Marco. Here, Eddie, rather than confronting the subtext with Catherine and Beatrice, chooses to project his inner turmoil into hatred toward Marco, as noted by Miller's physical description of Eddie as well as the character's repetitive, defensive dialogue.

Miller also uses repetition to express the importance of a person's name, as noted when Eddie expresses his concern that Marco, after rightfully accusing Eddie of informing, has tarnished Eddie's name in the neighborhood.

BEATRICE: What do you want! Eddie, what do you want!
EDDIE: I want my name! He [Rodolpho] didn't take my name—
to Rodolpho: and you can run tell him [Marco], kid, that he's gonna give it back to me in front of this neighborhood, or we have it out! (83)

This concern is expressed by the issue of “want.” Beatrice questions Eddie in the form of exclamation points, which Miller once again uses to offer a sense of urgency. Trying to determine Eddie's desire is important to Beatrice, shown by the

repetition of “what do you want!” Eddie’s response also emphasizes the word “want,” and he replies “I want my name!” This desire for his name is highlighted by Eddie’s repetition of his own name as Marco calls him out on page 84. The triple repetition—“Eddie Carbone. Eddie Carbone. Eddie Carbone”—serves as a way for Eddie to validate his own identity after betraying his family and the ideals he once held sacred.

The issue of a person’s name is further addressed by Eddie on page 84. He states:

Directly to Marco: Wipin’ the neighborhood with my name like a dirty rag! I want my name, Marco. *He is moving now, carefully, toward Marco.* Now gimme my name and we go together to the wedding.

The irony in this passage is that Eddie is so concerned with regaining *his* name, he ignores that his troubles are the result of his own actions; Eddie honestly believes that *he* is the wronged party. Thus the whole affair can be rectified if Marco would only give in and apologize; a simple apology, at least in Eddie’s view, is enough to restore good will. However, in giving Marco’s (and Rodolpho’s) name to the Immigration Officials, Eddie creates a circumstance that a mere apology cannot rectify. Miller uses the repetition of “name” to emphasize the far-reaching consequences that are associated with the act of informing—consequences that cannot be cleaned up neatly with an apology—for as Eddie himself emphasized earlier: “You can quicker get back a million dollars that was stole than a word you gave away” (18).

As Eddie tries to defend his actions before his neighbors, his sentences become more and more fragmented. Miller expands on this by turning the sentence fragments into questions—a technique that shows the desperation of an informer:

EDDIE—he gradually comes to address the people: He [Marco] knows that ain’t right. To do like that? To a man? Which I put my roof over their head and my food in their mouth? Like in the Bible? Strangers I never seen in my whole life? To come out of the water and grab a girl for a passport? To go and take from your own family like from the stable—and never a word to me? And now accusation in the bargain! (84)

This series of short questions shows Eddie's search for vindication from his peers. By turning sentence fragments into questions, Miller showcases Eddie's mental state. This technique is similar to the use of synchysis, in which Eddie's jumbled word order shows his confused frame of mind. Eddie cannot assert his statements about Marco as fact, especially since Eddie knows his assertions are based on lies; hence, Eddie questions the situation in an attempt to convince himself as well as his peers. The choppy progression of questions shows a lack of coherent thought and offers a sense of shallowness to Eddie's claims. The sentence variation, from short to long to short again, suggests the speed and motion of Eddie's charges—a dissonance that increases the tension of the moment for Miller's audience. These sentences also show the lack of coherence in Eddie's thought process as he jumps from topic to topic: his personal sacrifice for Marco and Rodolpho, the Bible, passports, accusations, all within one passage of dialogue.

The climax of the play has Miller offering a combination of repetition and lexical choices that distinguish elements of Eddie's character and denial for his actions, as well as Marco's desire for retribution:

EDDIE: No, Marco knows what's right from wrong. Tell the people, Marco, tell them what a liar you are. *He has his arms spread and Marco is spreading his.* Come on, liar, you know what you done! *He lunges for Marco as a great hushed shout goes up from the people.*

Marco strikes Eddie beside the neck.

MARCO: Animal! You go on your knees to me.

Shortly thereafter, both men's sentiments to one another are repeated.

EDDIE: You lied about me, Marco. Now say it. Come on now, say it.

MARCO: Anima-a-a-! (85)

Albert Maltz, quoting Baruch Spinoza, gives meaning to the imagery represented by Eddie and Marco in the play. He states:

It may be true, as Spinoza said, that if men do evil, it is only because they 'fall hostage to imperfect reasoning, to external causes and confusing passions.' But that does not make people less responsible for their actions. Responsibility is to be taken and assigned. (qtd. in

Despite Eddie's "imperfect reasoning" and "confusing passions" toward his niece, he ultimately commits an act of betrayal against his family and Marco holds Eddie accountable for this act. Whereas Eddie in seeking deliverance from his self-created dilemma is able to attempt reconciliation with Marco (ironically to have Marco slander himself for an act he did not commit), Marco, as the betrayed victim, assigns responsibility to Eddie. To emphasize this, Miller's word choice portrays Eddie as *non-human*; Marco responds to Eddie's allegations by calling Eddie an "animal" that, according to the *American Heritage Dictionary*, is "A living being other than a human being" (29). Marco is furious, and "animal" serves as a kind of battle cry as he fights Eddie for his honor. This is further highlighted when Miller extends "anima-a-a-l" during Marco and Eddie's confrontation. For Marco, "animal" is the ultimate insult he can call Eddie—an insult he deems comparable to Eddie's betrayal.

Miller's "animal" reference also serves as a cumulation for all the other animal images throughout the play—pigeons, canaries, rats, and the like—all of which have negative connotations regarding informers. Miller's animal imagery sets up the premise of a syllogism for his audience: informers are animals, Eddie is an informer, hence Eddie is an animal. Taken a step further, Miller projects the idea that an animal deserves to be treated like one; Eddie, like a good dog turned rabid, must now be sacrificed to protect the community.

View's emphasis on the act of informing elicits comparisons between the play and the activities of HUAC, as noted in J.L. Styon's discussion of *View* and *A Memory of Two Mondays*:

... their subject both were reflecting the ugliness of the McCarthy period, in which "friendly witnesses" could betray their former friends to the Un-American Activities Committee, by reaffirming that communal human relationships were still at the root of social life. (139)

In the case of *View*, correlations are prevalent between the play and the

Congressional hearings; however, Miller's rhetorical implications toward HUAC are somewhat reflective and latent in this work. Though the references to informing are present, they are not constant, allowing for a plethora of other issues to surface through Miller's rhetoric: "an incestuous motif, homosexuality, and, as I shall no doubt soon discover, eleven other neurotic patterns hidden within it, as well as the question of codes" (*Essays* 67). The subdued references to HUAC, and introspective nature of *A View from the Bridge*, may result from the time lapse between *The Crucible*, 1953, and the two-act version of *View*, produced three years later when the Committee's influence was beginning to wane. Miller had ample time to look beyond his animosity toward HUAC and explore what would possess a person to inform on another. The author's reflective treatment of the subject matter in no way justifies the act of informing; Miller's rhetorical strategies clearly condemn the informers, as noted in Eddie's transformation into an "animal." For Miller, the consequences of betrayal outweigh the reasons for treachery, a notion touched upon at the conclusion of *View* but critical to the thematic and rhetorical construction of *The Crucible*.

CHAPTER THREE

RHETORICAL TECHNIQUES IN *THE CRUCIBLE*

While Miller's *A View from the Bridge* addresses issues related to HUAC in a somewhat disguised manner, contemporary Americans could clearly determine the parallel between the subject matter of *The Crucible* and the political climate of the 1950s. In fact, the public was not alone; many critics emphasized this relationship between art and life by calling *The Crucible* "a cold, anti-McCarthy tract, more an outburst than a play" (Miller, *Essays* 294). Neil Carson comments on the perceived relationship between *The Crucible* and HUAC:

Although Miller had long been fascinated with the Salem story there can be little doubt that the immediate inspiration for the play was his perception of the effects of the atmosphere of terror inspired by the investigations of the communist 'conspiracy' in America in the late 1940s and 50s. (62)

That *The Crucible* has remained a popular dramatic work long after the days of McCarthyism shows it to be more significant than simply an allegory of the times. Miller states, "If *The Crucible* is still alive, it can hardly be due to any analogy with McCarthyism. It is received in the same way in countries that have never known such a wave of terror as those that have" (*Essays* 295).

Whatever Miller's motivations, the association between *The Crucible* and HUAC cannot be denied. The playwright says of his play, "*The Crucible* sought to include a higher degree of consciousness than the earlier plays" (*Essays* 173). Hence, with overt comparison between art and life present, Miller could only hope to enhance the consciousness of his audience through his use of language, i.e., his rhetorical techniques. Judging by the longevity and popularity of the play, Miller was able to accomplish this goal and alert his audience to the dangers of persecution and mass hysteria, be it the 1690s or 1990s.

This chapter, using the same criteria established in Chapter 2, will analyze *The Crucible* chronologically to explore Miller's main rhetorical techniques —

repetition, diction, syntax, and stage directions—as well as to determine how these techniques work congruently to influence the playwright’s audience. This analysis will demonstrate that *The Crucible*, unlike *A View from the Bridge*, is not as concerned with the psyche of an informer, for the informers/accusers in *The Crucible* willfully use accusations to ferment social hysteria in others as a vehicle for manipulative purposes. Miller’s rhetorical techniques expose the dangers of blind adherence to a cause, especially when people’s lives are at stake. In addition, Miller deftly uses repetition to demonstrate the detrimental effects of peer pressure and how easily people can be swayed against their better judgment, no matter how implausible the situation appears. Finally, Miller’s strategies emphasize the importance of maintaining one’s “name,” which, in this case, means pitting one’s integrity against the demands of social pressure—a conflict that entails questioning authority regardless of the personal cost.

Many of the social, moral, and psychological issues Miller addresses in *A View from the Bridge* are also found in *The Crucible*. In *View*, the issues are addressed through the actions of the multi-dimensional character of Eddie Carbone, yet in *The Crucible* the issues are showcased through a variety of characters, each with more clearly defined character traits but less complexity than Eddie.

The paranoia expressed by Eddie in *View* is seen through the dialogue of Reverend Parris in *The Crucible*. Parris becomes troubled after spying local girls—his daughter, Betty, included—“dancing like heathen in the forest,” which is forbidden since this act implies “conjuring spirits.” Betty has since taken ill and is in a lethargic state. In response to this chain of events, talk of witchcraft is occurring amongst the locals, as Abigail Williams, Parris’ beautiful, teenaged niece, who also took part of the dancing incident, is quick to remind Parris:

ABIGAIL: Uncle, the rumor of witchcraft is all about; I think you’d best go down and deny it yourself. The parlor’s packed with people, sir. I’ll sit with her [Betty].

She adds:

ABIGAIL: Uncle, we did dance; let you tell them I confessed it—and I'll be whipped if I must be. But they're speakin' of witchcraft. Betty's not witched. (9-10)

These passages, with the repetition of “witchcraft,” show the importance of witchcraft in the community of Salem. As seen in Abigail's statement, the mere rumor of witchcraft is enough for her to “confess” to the lesser offense of dancing in the forest, even at the risk of being whipped for her actions. That she instantly accepts this threat, combined with her willingness to confess to Parris, suggest that far worse consequences will prevail if Abigail is accused of witchcraft.

In addition, Abigail's dialogue brings forth the notion of confessing. As presented here, Abigail is not merely obligated to “confess” to Reverend Parris, she is also required to confess to the community which is referred to as “them.” Confessing is presented as an acceptable way of redeeming oneself when accused by the community. Like Eddie Carbone's feelings toward the Immigration authorities, and Miller's feelings toward HUAC, Abigail is concerned with authority and the implications of being singled out for an “undesirable” action. The difference here is that Abigail is a member of the community; hence Miller implies that a person is in good standing with the community as long as he or she stays in line with the ideologies of the people; divergence can carry a heavy cost. Lillian Hellman, although discussing life during the McCarthy era, touches on the universality of the dilemma facing the residents of Salem: “. . . if you differ from society, no matter how many pieties they talk, they will punish you for disturbing them” (47).

The rumors of witchcraft have Reverend Parris worried as well. He states:

PARRIS: Now look you, child, your punishment will come in its time. But if you trafficked with spirits in the forest I must know it now, for surely my enemies will, and they will ruin me with it.

He adds:

. . . It must come out—my enemies will bring it out. Let me know what you done there. Abigail, do you understand that I have many enemies.
(10)

Parris' repetition of "enemies" exemplifies his obsessive nature. Parris' anxiety also parallels Eddie's fear of informers in Act I of *View*. Both characters project paranoia about possible factions of society that could somehow bring about their downfalls. Interestingly, in Parris' case, whether witches were actually summoned (a matter of significance for a clergyman) is of little importance as long as his enemies are given no ammunition that can be used to discredit him.

The issue of a person's name offers parallels to the close of *View* when Eddie so adamantly strives to "get his name back" from Marco. Whereas the question of one's "name" occurs at *View*'s conclusion, it is brought up early in *The Crucible* and lingers throughout the play.

PARRIS: . . . Your name in the town—it is entirely white, is it not?
ABIGAIL, *with an edge of resentment*: Why, I am sure it is, sir. There be no blush about my name.

She continues:

ABIGAIL, *in a temper*: My name is good in the village! I will not have it said my name is soiled. Goody Proctor is a gossiping liar! (Miller, *Crucible* 12)

As with Eddie Carbone, Abigail is concerned with her reputation in the eyes of the community. That Miller's stage directions cite Abigail as being "resentful" and "in a temper" indicates that this may not be the first time her character has been questioned. Abigail, like Eddie, is determined that her name not be tarnished before her peers, as seen in her assertion "I will not have it said my name is soiled." This declaration shows that Abigail will do what is necessary to protect her name and her interests.

Much like *A View from the Bridge*, Act I of *The Crucible* showcases Miller's use of the vernacular, primarily in the diction and syntax found in seventeenth-century Salem, Massachusetts. Miller uses the vernacular in *View* to embrace the American public and to stress the consequences of informing whatever the

informer's social status; however, in *The Crucible*, the author—acknowledging the obvious parallels between the Salem witchtrials and the HUAC hearings—distances his audience by stressing the archaic diction and sentence structure of historic Salem. This technique was necessary for, as Leonard Moss states:

The analogy seemed clear enough even though the setting of the play was a Massachusetts colony; the government, a Puritan "theocracy"; the prosecutor, Deputy Governor Danforth; and the subversives, Satan's agents disguised as ordinary townsfolk. Miller did not deny the obvious contemporary relevance, but insisted that he was concerned with a problem larger than the current investigations. (59)

As he did in *View*, Miller omits letters from words to demonstrate the characters' speech patterns, primarily of characters like Mary Warren—whose dialogue includes "talkin'," "callin'," and "hangin'" (18)—who are subordinate to the other characters. In addition, Miller, having researched the actual court records of the witchtrials, replicated the sentence structure used in Salem, language he considered to be a "gnarled way of speaking"; he states: "in more time I came to love its feel, like hard burnished wood. Without planning to, I even elaborated a few of the grammatical forms myself, the double negatives especially, which occurred in the trial record much less frequently than they would in the play" (*Timebends* 336). For example, John Proctor's reprimand of Mary Warren, as does Miller's dialogue throughout the play, emulates the speech patterns used by the residents of Salem:

Be you foolish, Mary Warren? Be you deaf? I forbid you leave the house, did I not? Why shall I pay you? I am looking for you more often than my cows! (21)

Thomas E. Porter comments on Miller's efforts by stating that "the dialogue has a suitable seventeenth-century flavor" (81). By setting up the dialogue in this fashion, Miller dictates the vocal interpretation of the text, i.e., the naturalistic or realistic delivery that aims at an accurate reproduction of natural speech (Esslin, *Field* 63). Thus, while the subject matter of *The Crucible* correlates to the HUAC hearings, the

actual mechanics of the play do not. In fact, according to Edmund S. Morgan, “With regard to the Salem witchcraft of the 1690s, the temptation has always been to exaggerate the differences between that time and ours” (174-75). Such exaggeration was necessary for Miller’s play to keep from becoming a theatrical analogy for McCarthyism, for as Miller states, “Before a play can be ‘about’ something else, it has to be about itself” (*Essays* 295).

Although the characters are not in a court setting, Miller uses a series of short sentences, in a question/answer format, to give the dialogue between Reverend Hale and Tituba the feeling of an interrogation:

HALE: . . . You would be a good Christian woman, would you not, Tituba?
TITUBA: Aye, sir, a good Christian woman.
HALE: And you love these little children?
TITUBA: Oh, yes, sir, I don’t desire to hurt little children.
HALE: And you love God, Tituba?
TITUBA: I love God with all my bein’.
HALE: Now, in God’s holy name—
TITUBA: Bless Him. Bless Him. *She is rocking on her knees, sobbing in terror.*
HALE: And to His glory—
TITUBA: Eternal glory. Bless Him—Bless God . . . (45)

By questioning Tituba in this fashion, Hale, the preacher and scholar, assumes the role of a prosecutor; Hale is clearly in authority, controlling the conversation. Tituba, with her affirmations (“Aye, sir” and “Oh, yes, sir”), is subservient and will acquiesce in order to get Hale’s approval, regardless of how far she must stray from the truth. The repetitive nature of her answers serve to mirror Hale’s questions, as if hearing the same words from her mouth would legitimize Tituba’s answers to her accuser.

At this point, the conversation shifts to the topic of names as Hale inquires whether Tituba—who admits under pressure that she has seen the Devil—has seen others with the Devil when he surfaces. A semantic shift in the word “name” is seen here. Whereas “name” referred to a person’s character and/or reputation earlier in

the play (as with Abigail's concerns about her name becoming "soiled"), "name" now becomes a vehicle to incriminate other people as participants in the subversive activity of the day—Devil worship, as seen in the verbal exchange between Hale, Parris, Putnam, and Tituba:

HALE: When the Devil comes to you does he ever come—with another person? *She stares up into his face.* Perhaps another person in the village? Someone you know.

PARRIS: Who came with him [the devil]?

PUTNAM: Sarah Good? Did you ever see Sarah Good with him? Or Osburn?

PARRIS: Was it man or woman came with him?

TITUBA: Man or woman. Was—was woman.

PARRIS: What woman? A woman, you said. What woman?

TITUBA: It was black dark, and I—

PARRIS: You could see him, why could you not see her? (45-46)

Hale and Parris continue their questioning of Tituba:

HALE, *kindly*: Who came to you with the Devil? Two? Three? Four? How many?

Tituba pants, and begins rocking back and forth again, staring ahead.

TITUBA: There was four. There was four.

PARRIS, *pressing in on her*: Who? Who? Their names, their names! (46-47)

The question/answer format—and short, choppy sentences—Miller employs in his dialogue creates a sensation of movement and tension for the audience. The structure of the dialogue establishes a feeling of pathos for Tituba, who is outnumbered and clearly under attack by those around her—people superior to her in power and status. The barrage of questions wears down not only Tituba, but Miller's audience as well. The pressure generated by this technique gives justification to Tituba's false claim of seeing townspeople with the Devil: she *cracks* under the pressure of interrogation; she is coerced by authority figures to tell them what they want to hear.

Most striking, however, is that this line of questioning parallels the questions used by the prosecutors in the HUAC hearings. Like Tituba in this passage, those

called to testify before HUAC were repeatedly asked to name other people, often co-workers or friends, who were involved in the subversive activity of the day—Communism. A similar line of questioning is seen in Miller's own testimony before HUAC as the playwright was questioned by Richard Arens, Director of the House Committee on Un-American Activities:

MR. ARENS: Do you know a person by the name of Sue Warren?

MR. MILLER: I couldn't recall at this moment.

MR. ARENS: Do you know or have you known a person by the name of Arnaud D'Usseau? D-'-U-s-s-e-a-u?

MR. MILLER: I have met him.

MR. ARENS: What has been the nature of your activity in connection with Arnaud D'Usseau?

MR. MILLER: Just what is the point?

MR. ARENS: Have you been in any Communist Party sessions with Arnaud D'Usseau?

MR. MILLER: I was present at meetings of Communist Party writers in 1947, about five or six meetings.

MR. ARENS: Where were those meetings held?

MR. MILLER: They were held in someone's apartment. I don't know whose it was. (United States, 34th Cong. 32)

This example mirrors the structure and format of Tituba's question/answer session in *The Crucible*, including the mentioning of specific names by the interrogators: Sarah Good and Goody Osburn in *Crucible*, Sue Warren and Arnaud D'Usseau at the HUAC hearing. The difference in Miller's case was that his responses to the Committee were the result of conscious thought and decision. Also, unlike Tituba, Miller was not fearful for his life. Nonetheless, the issue of naming names was an important consideration for the accusers in both instances.

Interestingly, in both Salem and HUAC, the concern for naming others became so important that the core issue of controversy, witchcraft or Communism, was dwarfed by comparison. In fact, in 1952, Lillian Hellman, at the risk of a contempt of court citation, offered to discuss her own activities but refused to discuss the activities of others. Hellman addressed this issue in a letter to John S. Wood, Chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities:

I am most willing to answer all questions about myself. I have nothing to

hide from your committee and there is nothing in my life of which I am ashamed. . . . But there is one principle that I do understand: I am not willing, now or in the future, to bring bad trouble to people who in my past association with them were completely innocent of any talk or any action that was disloyal or subversive. . . . But to hurt innocent people whom I knew many years ago in order to save myself is, to me inhuman and indecent and dishonorable. I cannot and will not cut my conscience to fit this year's fashions. . . . (United States, 32th Cong., 3545-46)

Unlike Hellman, who eventually sought protection against self-incrimination under the Fifth Amendment of the Constitution, Arthur Miller, when called to testify before HUAC, risked a contempt of court citation and possible jail sentence by invoking the First Amendment's guarantee of free speech and/or silence (Navasky 216). He states:

There was no doubt in my mind, however, that I would never give the Committee the names of people, all of them writers, whom I had known to be Communists, and this had nothing to do with anything but myself; I might have every rational reason to conform to the fashion of the time except for a single overriding consideration: I simply could not believe that anything I knew or any individual I could name was in the remotest sense a danger to democracy in America. (*Timebends* 397)

Not everyone called to testify before HUAC or interrogated during the witchhunts chronicled in *The Crucible* shared the conviction of Hellman and Miller. Navasky quotes Abe Polonsky, a blacklisted writer and director, who addresses the *practicality* of informers:

Polonsky argues that for most of the people who cooperated with HUAC, it was not a moral, ethical, or political question at all. It was a practical question—but people don't like to think of it that way because it makes their character less worthy. 'In most cases the informers picked a route that seemed to them an easy solution to a difficult problem; in other words, they could handle their own friends, whom they testified against, better than they could handle the U.S. government harassing them.' (279-80)

Polonsky's statement may explain the actions of Abigail in *The Crucible*. Abigail's involvement in the forest with Tituba and the other girls placed her in jeopardy with both church officials and the townspeople. She also knows that the punishment for her actions will amount to more than a whipping, for trafficking in witchcraft could

lead to the gallows. Therefore, Tituba, Reverend Parris' slave, offers Abigail the perfect vehicle by which to absolve her own actions:

Mrs. Putnam enters with Tituba, and instantly Abigail points at Tituba.

ABIGAIL: She made me do it! She made Betty do it!

TITUBA: *shocked and angry*: Abby!

ABIGAIL: She makes me drink blood!

PARRIS: Blood!!

MRS. PUTNAM: My baby's blood?

TITUBA: No, no chicken blood. I give she chicken blood.

Abigail continues:

ABIGAIL: She sends her spirit on me in church; she makes me laugh at prayer!

PARRIS: She have often laughed at prayer!

ABIGAIL: She comes to me every night to go and drink blood!

TITUBA: You beg *me* to conjure! She beg *me* make charm—

ABIGAIL: Don't lie! (43-44)

Miller's stage directions offer insights into Abigail's character. That Abigail "instantly" points to Tituba portrays Abigail as one who satisfies her own needs at the expense of others. Abigail's dialogue also provides insights into her nature:

Every word of dramatic dialogue thus carries (at least) a double charge: the factual meaning of the words, on the one hand; the information they yield about the character of the speaker on the other. (Esslin, *Field* 82)

That Abigail laughs at prayer is a factual and accurate statement that is affirmed by Parris, yet her laughter is not the result of *possession* by Tituba: Abigail merely distorts fact to justify her actions. For Abigail and the others who confess, the *facts* of their accusations are skewed by their personal motivations for testifying.

Abigail's relentless nature is highlighted in this passage since she drank Tituba's charm willingly. As Betty states in a brief period of *remission* (when her father is out of the room): "You [Abigail] drank a charm to kill John Proctor's wife! You drank a charm to kill Goody Proctor!"² (19).

Miller uses the repetition of "she" and "makes" in this passage to amplify Abigail's transference of blame to Tituba. If "she" [Tituba] "made" Abby commit

acts against her will, Abby could not be held accountable in the eyes of the community. This ploy shifts accountability for the misdoings to Tituba who must now defend her own actions. The italicized use of “me” creates a reversal by showing that Abby solicited Tituba’s assistance in making the spells and was not *forced* into any action. Another reversal is Abigail’s exclamation “Don’t lie!” Abigail, telling Tituba not to lie, parallels *A View from the Bridge* when Eddie claims Marco is lying; however, the motives of Abigail and Eddie differ substantially; although both lie to save face in the community, Eddie essentially lies out of denial to himself—his inner feelings are in such turmoil that he is incapable of admitting the truth. Abigail, being an opportunist, knows exactly what she is doing; she is, as Polonsky states, seeking “an easy solution to a difficult problem” (qtd. in Navasky 280).

Tituba, seeing no other way out of her dilemma, concocts a tale of how the Devil came to her claiming to have white people at his disposal including Sarah Good and Goody Osburn. Suddenly, to the surprise of all involved, Abigail volunteers a confession of her own:

Abigail rises, staring as though inspired, and cries out.

ABIGAIL: I want to open myself! *They turn to her, startled. She is enraptured, as though in a pearly light.* I want the light of God, I want the sweet love of Jesus! I danced for the Devil; I saw him; I wrote in his book; I go back to Jesus; I kiss His hand. I saw Sarah Good with the Devil! I saw Goody Osburn with the Devil! I saw Bridget Bishop with the Devil!

As she is speaking, Betty is rising from the bed, a fever in her eyes, and picks up the chant.

BETTY, *staring too*: I saw George Jacobs with the Devil! I saw Goody Howe with the Devil!

PARRIS: She speaks! *He rushes to embrace Betty.* She speaks!

HALE: Glory to God! It is broken, they are free!

BETTY, *calling out hysterically and with great relief*: I saw Martha Bellows with the Devil!

ABIGAIL: I saw Goody Sibber with the Devil! *It is rising to great glee.*

PUTNAM: The marshal, I’ll call the marshal!

Parris is shouting a prayer of thanksgiving.

BETTY: I saw Alice Barrow with the Devil!

The curtain begins to fall.

HALE, *as Putnam goes out*: Let the marshal bring irons!
ABIGAIL: I saw Goody Hawkins with the Devil!
BETTY: I saw Goody Bibber with the Devil!
ABIGAIL: I saw Goody Booth with the Devil!
On their ecstatic cries
THE CURTAIN FALLS (48)

Although the audience feels sympathetic for Tituba's confession under pressure, no such sympathy can be felt toward Abigail's confession, for she was not pressured but, rather, capitalizes on the passion of the moment to redeem herself. Unlike the passage where Abigail seeks to blame Tituba, which emphasizes the word "she," Abigail—sensing benefit from a new strategy—now turns the focus on herself by repeating "I" in her confession. In addition, whereas originally Tituba "made" Abigail do things against her will, Abigail now "wants" to take full responsibility to win sympathy for herself. Betty also senses opportunity in this ploy, for she conveniently awakens out of her *bewitchment* and spews out her own accusations.

Miller effectively climaxes Act I with repeated variations of "I saw Sarah Good with the Devil!" In all, the variations occur eleven times, which gives the scene a frantic, chant-like quality and strong sense of rhythm—examples of what Esslin describes as the structure of the dialogue:

... the dynamic of contrasts between long and short, violent and quiet segments, repetition and assonance; the rhythms inherent in the dialogue, the pauses and silence which, even if they are not indicated by stage directions ... are, in skilfully [sic] written texts overwhelmingly strongly imposed by the structure of words and sentence rhythms; and by the subtle 'timing' of the dialogue itself. (*Field* 82)

According to Esslin, the rhythm and signifying structures in drama are factors that determine the attention span of the audience, if their concentration is riveted or relaxed, and the way the eventual meaning of the play is received by those in attendance (*Field* 115).

The intensity of the scene is chronicled through Miller's stage directions such as "cries out," "rushes," and "calling out hysterically," all of which foster a great

emotional state for the audience. In fact, Miller states "*It is rising to a great glee,*" the "it" being the phenomena now occurring between the two girls as if their confessions have become personified. Mainly, the dialogue's repetition and rhythm bestows a loss of control to the theatergoers, especially since the authority figures are ready to "bring irons" for innocent people based solely on the accusations of young girls. This passage offers the feeling of impending doom.

John Proctor, since the beginning of the play, considers the events plaguing Salem as "mischief": not only is he skeptical about the town's "mumblings" of witchcraft, but he also learns from Abigail that Betty is not possessed by demons but rather has "took fright":

PROCTOR, *looking at Abigail now, the faintest suggestion of a knowing smile on his face*: What's this mischief here?

ABIGAIL, *with a nervous laugh*: Oh, she's [Betty Parris] only gone silly somehow.

She adds:

ABIGAIL: . . . We were dancin' in the woods last night, and my uncle leaped in on us. She took fright, is all.

PROCTOR, *his smile widening*: Ah, you're wicked yet, aren't ye'! . . . You'll be clapped in the stocks before you're twenty. (21-22)

Miller's diction and stage directions connote a sense of playfulness that provides a reversal to the events occurring later in the play. The word "mischief" emphasizes concern on Proctor's part but not a feeling of danger. Also, Abigail says Betty has merely "gone silly"—a far cry from the impressions of witchcraft being acknowledged throughout the town. In addition, Proctor's "knowing smile" and Abigail's "nervous laugh" offer a feeling of levity, particularly since Proctor is normally a serious man. Ironically, his statement that Abigail is "wicked," meant in a playful vein, foreshadows her true nature.

As seen in Act II, the townspeople regard Abigail and the other girls as anything but playful; in fact, the fate of the community is in their hands, as Elizabeth explains to Proctor:

ELIZABETH: The Deputy Governor promise hangin' if they'll not confess, John. The town's gone wild, I think. She [Mary Warren] speak of Abigail, and I thought she were a saint, to hear her. Abigail brings the other girls into the court, and where she walks the crowd will part like the sea for Israel. And folks are brought before them, and if they scream and howl and fall to the floor—the person's clapped in the jail for bewitchin' them.

PROCTOR, *wide-eyed*: Oh, it is a black mischief. (52-53)

Proctor's statement and stage direction is a direct reversal of his prior talk with Abigail. He is now "wide-eyed," not smiling; it is no longer mischief, but "black" mischief that poses a sense of evil and wickedness. Elizabeth illustrates the girls' authority in the town by stating that "the crowd will part like the sea for Israel". By linking the girls' acts of bewitchment with "and" in "scream and howl and fall to the floor," Miller projects a sense of sarcasm and disbelief on Elizabeth's part. These acts, on their own, can be viewed as serious afflictions; however, by linking the acts with "and," Elizabeth, in describing the girls' outrageous behavior, connotes a lack of credibility regarding the court's procedures; she seems amazed that such transparent ploys can land someone in jail. Miller saw an equal hollowness in McCarthy's ploys during the HUAC hearings:

... he'd [McCarthy] say, "We possess the names of all these people who are guilty. But the time has not come yet to release them" He had nothing at all—he simply wanted to secure in the town's mind the idea that he saw everything, that everyone was transparent to him. It was a way of inflicting guilt on everybody, and many people responded genuinely out of guilt; some would come and tell him some fantasy, or something that they had done or thought that was evil in their minds. (Carlisle and Styron 290)

Ironically, Proctor's guilt (from his adulterous relations with Abigail) keeps him from coming forward with his knowledge that Betty only "took fright." When he eventually tells Hale that "the children's sickness had naught to do with witchcraft," well after the witchtrials are underway, Proctor's only recourse for his inaction is stating "I never knew until tonight that the world is gone daft with this nonsense" (68). "Nonsense," like "mischief," affirms Proctor's feelings toward the town's

actions; however, emphasizing “the world” details how out of hand the situation has become.

In Act II, Miller uses repetition in the characters’ dialogue to address the insidious nature of the accusations against local townspeople, as Mary Warren tries to explain the events that led to the accusation and subsequent confession of Sarah Good for using witchcraft:

MARY WARREN: . . . all at once I remembered everything she [Sarah Good] done to me!

PROCTOR: Why? What did she do to you?

MARY WARREN, *like one awakened to a marvelous secret insight*: So many time, Mr. Proctor, she come to this very door, beggin’ bread and a cup of cider—and mark this: whenever I turned her away empty, she *mumbled*.

ELIZABETH: Mumbled! She may mumble if she’s hungry.

MARY WARREN: But *what* does she mumble? (57-58)

By italicizing the first instance of the word “*mumbled*,” and by having Mary Warren preface her statement with “and mark this,” Miller conveys that the simple act of mumbling has become wicked. This seems obvious to Mary Warren, and her dialogue implies that it should be obvious for Proctor and Elizabeth as well.

Italicizing “*what*” in Mary Warren’s last sentence creates a cause and effect relationship: since Sarah Good mumbled, she may have mumbled about witchcraft. And since Mary Warren claims to have had stomach pains about the same time, Sarah Good must have cursed her and, hence, is a witch. This logic does not sit well with John Proctor and he questions the validity of the statement:

PROCTOR: But the proof, the proof!

MARY WARREN, *with greater impatience with him*: I told you the proof. It’s hard proof, hard as rock, the judges said. (58)

The repetition of “mumble” brings to the forefront the pettiness of the charges and also demonstrates that regardless how improbable the charges of witchcraft were, they were deemed perfectly acceptable by the court. According to *Webster’s New World Dictionary*, to “mumble” is “to speak or say indistinctly; mutter” (396). By

definition, a mumble is barely audible; hence, even if Mary Warren heard Sarah Good's mumble, she has no proof that Good caused her to feel that her "guts would burst." Although a mumble cannot be proved, it was enough of a charge to get a person hanged in Salem without any real attempt to prove the authenticity of the claim.

As outlandish as this circumstance seems, similarities exist between Mary Warren's charge and accusations made during the HUAC hearings. According to Lillian Hellman, "We, as a people, agreed in the Fifties to swallow any nonsense that was repeated often enough, without examination of its meaning or investigation into its roots" (75). And while a "mumble" may not have constituted a legitimate charge during the days of HUAC, writers could be subpoenaed for a host of reasons, including "old letterheads and donations and attendance lists, the cobwebby stringing of 'ties' from shadow to shadow" (Willis 9).

Another similarity between Miller's play and the HUAC hearings is the notion of being "somewhat mentioned." In the play, Mary Warren—trying to avoid a whipping by Proctor for disobeying him—states that Elizabeth Proctor was "mentioned" in court proceedings by Abigail Williams, a claim that for all practical reasons stands as an accusation:

MARY WARREN, *pointing at Elizabeth*: I saved her life today!

Silence. His whip comes down.

ELIZABETH, *softly*, I am accused?

MARY WARREN, *quaking*: Somewhat mentioned. But I said I never see no sign you ever sent your spirit out to hurt no one, and seeing I do live so closely with you, they dismissed it. (59)

Reverend Hales expands on this theme in a visit to the Proctor's home:

HALE: I know not if you are aware, but your wife's name is—mentioned in the court.

PROCTOR: We know it, sir. Our Mary Warren told us. We are entirely amazed.

HALE: I am a stranger here, as you know. And in my ignorance I find it hard to draw a clear opinion of them that come accused before the court. And so this afternoon, and now tonight, I go from house to house — I come now from Rebecca Nurse's house and—

ELIZABETH, *shocked*: Rebecca's charged!

HALE: God forbid such a one be charged. She is, however, mentioned somewhat. (63-64)

Although a lexical difference exists between being mentioned and being accused, Miller's use of "mentioned" denotes that a clear relationship exists: "mentioned" becomes a synonym for "accused." This relationship is seen in Hale's response to Elizabeth's exclamation "Rebecca's Charged!" He insists that Rebecca isn't charged, yet "however" qualifies that extenuating circumstances exist. Hence, by being "mentioned somewhat," a person may not be officially "charged," but it by no means indicates that the person is in the clear either.

Being "mentioned" during the McCarthy era had similar implications for the accused. For example, screenwriter Howard Koch, a non-Communist, was subpoenaed because Jack Warner mentioned him in the same context as Communist writers (Dick 3). As Navasky states, "The free-floating guilt that was in the air visited the innocent— Communist and non-Communist alike" (355). He describes the story of an actress, Mildred Dunnock, who, though non-political, was considered a Communist sympathizer because of her friendship with Lillian Hellman, Arthur Miller, and Elia Kazan: "Suddenly, job offers—particularly from television—stopped coming" (355). Hence, in both Salem and Hollywood, association with subversive people/activities meant more than associating: it meant guilt.

Miller addresses an interesting transformation as the accusers realize that with the church and court accepting their claims as gospel, they are now in a position of power—their actions literally mean the difference between life and death. This metamorphosis is seen in Mary Warren's actions toward her employers, the Proctors. Originally, in the stage directions, Mary is "a little strained" by Proctor's doubts about Sarah Good's guilt. She then shows "greater impatience with him" (58) and, even facing the prospect of being whipped, is "terrified, but coming erect,

striving for her authority” (59). Her growing defiance is seen in the following passage:

MARY WARREN, *with a stamp of her foot*: I’ll not be ordered to bed no more, Mr. Proctor! I am eighteen and a woman, however single!
PROCTOR: Do you wish to sit up? Then sit up.
MARY WARREN: I wish to go to bed!
PROCTOR, *in anger*: Good night, then!
MARY WARREN: Good night. (60)

The stamping of Mary Warren’s foot takes her defiance to a physical level that is heard and felt by Miller’s audience. In addition, the short passages between Proctor and Warren offer a battle of wills, with Mary Warren’s “wish” to go to bed ultimately fulfilled.

Elizabeth senses danger for herself and the community. She states “Oh, the noose, the noose is up!” to which Proctor replies, “There’ll be no noose” (60). This is not the first time Proctor denies the extent of the “mischief” occurring in Salem. On page 52, Proctor states, “Ah, they’d never hang—” referring to the fourteen people then in jail and charged with witchcraft. Proctor, whom Miller describes as “powerful of body, even-tempered, and not easily led” (20), cannot comprehend the extent of the danger in the proceedings; hence Miller’s use of negative terms like “no” and “never” show that Proctor sees no imminent danger—he feels rationality will prevail and put an end to the insanity. Miller concurs with that state of mind and, referring to the HUAC hearings, states, “I had no idea that it was going to go as far as it went” (*Essays* 290). Although the rain of their respective times dampened the faces of both Proctor and Miller, neither could foresee the deadly storms on the horizon. Miller states:

Twenty years of conservative frustration with contemporary America was unleashed until, like the girls [of Salem], McCarthy was in a position of such incredible authority that the greatest people in the land shuttered at the thought that their names might fall from his snickering lips. (*Essays* 298)

The issue of faith versus blind adherence is shown through the dialogue between Proctor, Elizabeth, and Hale, primarily with the repetition of the words

“witches” and “Gospel” as Hale questions the Proctor’s beliefs:

PROCTOR: . . . I have wondered if there be witches in the world—although I cannot believe they come among us now.

HALE: Then you do not believe—

PROCTOR: I have no knowledge of it; the Bible speaks of witches, and I will not deny them.

HALE: And you, woman?

ELIZABETH: I—I cannot believe it.

HALE, *shocked*: You cannot!

Hale soon adds:

HALE: But, woman, you do believe there are witches in—

ELIZABETH: If you think that I am one, then I say there are none.

HALE: You surely do not fly against the Gospel, the Gospel—

PROCTOR: She believe in the Gospel, every word!

ELIZABETH: Question Abigail Williams about the Gospel, not myself!
(69-70)

The Proctor’s dialogue portrays them as independent thinkers in a society that accepts the majority of things on faith. The repetition of “witches” between Proctor and Hale depicts witches as a concern for both men, but for different reasons. Hale stresses “witches” because of his belief in them based on the Gospel. Proctor, on the other hand, says he “won’t deny” their existence even though he has “no knowledge” of witches. Hence, for Proctor, the Gospel is not enough to affirm his belief; he must find proof on his own terms, not simply on what is written or widely accepted by his peers. Proctor’s need for personal knowledge is also seen on page 64 when he states, “I have no knowledge in that line [affirming that the village is under attack by dark powers]. But it’s hard to think so pious a woman [as Rebecca Nurse] be secretly a Devil’s bitch after seventy years of such good prayer.” Since the town’s beliefs contradict what Proctor sees as true, he voices his doubts, as does Elizabeth when she questions the Gospel. Miller’s repetition of “Gospel” emphasizes its importance in Salem and affirms Elizabeth’s doubts as a serious breach of faith.

Hale cannot bring himself to question the Gospel, though he maintains doubts

of his own as seen on pages 68 and 69:

HALE: . . . I have myself examined Tituba, Sarah Good, and numerous others that have confessed to dealing with the Devil. They have *confessed* it.

PROCTOR: And why not, if they must hang for denyin' it? There are them that will swear to anything before they'll hang; have you never thought of that?

HALE: I have. I—I have indeed.

By having Hale stutter in the last line, Miller establishes a lack of conviction in Hale. The Reverend obviously has his doubts but is afraid to admit his reservations to himself or anyone else, for that would force Hale to question his faith; that people “have confessed” is enough for Hale to equate their claims with the truth. Thus, Miller alludes to the importance of questioning acts that defy reason, for acts of blind adherence, like Hale's, and like so many called before HUAC, can have dire consequences.

Miller offers variations in sentence length and punctuation to stress the plight of Giles Corey and Francis Nurse, whose wives have been charged with witchcraft:

Giles Corey appears in doorway.

GILES: John!

PROCTOR: Giles! What's the matter?

GILES: They take my wife.

Francis Nurse enters.

GILES: And his Rebecca!

PROCTOR, *to Francis*: Rebecca's in the *jail*!

FRANCIS: Aye, Cheever come and take her in his wagon. We've only now come from the jail, and they'll not even let us in to see them.

ELIZABETH: They've surely gone wild now, Mr. Hale! (70-71)

The short sentences at the beginning of this passage create a rhythmic, fast pace that fosters urgency in Miller's audience as they witness the play's townspeople realize that their greatest fears are materializing before them. Miller's heavy use of exclamation marks adds a feeling of increased emotion to the dialogue, emphasizing the panic of the speakers. Last, by italicizing “*jail*,” Miller marks Proctor's disbelief, as if sending a woman like Rebecca to jail is an impossible occurrence.

To Proctor's dismay, Elizabeth is accused of bewitching Abigail Williams.

In defense of his wife, Proctor unleashes a barrage of questions as he verbalizes his rising frustrations to Hale, whom Proctor now views as “a broken minister”:

PROCTOR: If *she* [Elizabeth] is innocent! Why do you never wonder if Parris be innocent, or Abigail? Is the accuser always holy now? Were they born this morning as clean as God's fingers? I'll tell you what's walking Salem—vengeance is walking Salem. We are what we always were in Salem, but now the little crazy children are jangling the keys of the kingdom, and common vengeance writes the law! This warrant's vengeance! I'll not give my wife to vengeance! (77)

Proctor's questions to Hale are reminiscent of Eddie Carbone's questions to Catherine in *A View from the Bridge* (48). In both cases, the numerous questions are asked too quickly to get a response; thus the questions serve to show the speakers' emotional frustration. Yet where Eddie questions his own nature, Proctor questions the nature of the community's dilemma. This is further emphasized by the repetition of “vengeance.” Although ulterior motives on behalf of the accusers are alluded to throughout the play, Proctor is the first to state that vengeance is the root of the problem. According to Moss, Proctor surmises accurately:

Greater harm, however, was done for personal than for political reasons. . . . These egoistic motives are illustrated by minor details in the play: the quarrel between Putnam and Proctor over lumber, Reverend Parris's preoccupation with firewood and candleholders, and Giles's propensities for litigation. Selfish motives are also illustrated in the major incidents that magnify excitement prior to the explosion of hysteria; Miller sees bewitchment as a mental state that can be deliberately induced by unscrupulous individuals. (60)

Vengeance appears to have played a similar role in the HUAC hearings. Navasky states that many of those who informed felt that the victims “had it coming to them, they deserved what they got” (285). He goes on to describe that one of Elia Kazan's reasons for testifying was to detail how his “comrades” betrayed him eighteen years earlier (285). Proctor's dialogue indicates, as do these examples, that nefarious individuals can manipulate situations to instill mass hysteria in others as a forum to even old scores, no matter what the cost to the victims.

On page 87, Miller addresses the court prosecutors, primarily Deputy

Governor Danforth, whom Miller describes as a man with “an exact loyalty to his position and his cause” (85). Danforth’s dialogue portrays him as a man not afraid of using his power to intimidate, as Francis Nurse soon discovers:

DANFORTH: Peace, Judge Hathorne. Do you know who I am, Mr. Nurse?

FRANCIS: I surely do, sir, and I think you must be a wise judge to be what you are.

DANFORTH: And do you know that near to four hundred are in the jails from Marblehead to Lynn, upon my signature?

FRANCIS: I—

DANFORTH: And seventy-two condemned to hang by that signature?

FRANCIS: Excellency, I never thought to say it to such a weighty judge, but you are deceived. (87)

Danforth’s line of questioning demonstrates the importance he places on himself and the task he has undertaken. By stressing numbers that pertain to the Judge’s efforts such as “four hundred,” and “seventy-two,” as well as the range of cities “Marblehead to Lynn,” Miller’s diction implies a large group of people, covering a vast distance, who find their fate determined by the Deputy Governor. Danforth’s dialogue emphasizes his power—he is definitely a man to be taken seriously; he is, as Francis states, “weighty.” The repetition of “signature” shows Danforth’s concern with his name; in essence, a person’s signature is an instrument of significance, a reflection of one’s character. Danforth’s use of “signature” can be juxtaposed with Proctor’s dilemma about his own signature at the play’s conclusion. Miller, in presenting Danforth’s status and power, also demonstrates Francis Nurse’s courage and adherence to the truth. Danforth can easily condemn Francis, yet Francis is compelled to dispute Danforth, for Nurse sees a greater danger in the hysteria of Salem.

A deeper glimpse into Danforth’s motivations occur on page 91. He states:

DANFORTH: I judge nothing. *Pause. He keeps watching Proctor, who tries to meet his gaze.* I tell you straight, Mister—I have seen marvels in this court. I have seen people choked before my eyes by spirits; I have seen them stuck by pins and slashed by daggers. I have until this moment not the slightest reason to suspect that the children may be deceiving me. Do you understand my meaning?

Danforth's dialogue reveals a firm belief in his convictions and his actions. By repeating "I have," Danforth takes direct responsibility for condemning hundreds to hang for witchcraft. When he says to Proctor "I tell you straight, Mister," he sincerely believes it; unfortunately, in his overzealousness, Danforth mistakes deception for reality; this miscalculation, combined with his power, makes Danforth a very dangerous man. As Moss states: "Not everyone who contributed to that madness he [Miller] admits, was villainous. Some officials, like Danforth, Reverend Hale, and Judge Hathorne committed the gravest wrongs in the name of the public welfare, as they conceived it" (60).

Moss' conception of the authorities in Salem is in stark contrast to the perception of those in power during the HUAC hearings, as noted in Hellman's statement about the men who prosecuted her:

Senators McCarthy and McCarran, Representatives Nixon, Walter and Wood, all of them, were what they were: men who invented when necessary, maligned even when it wasn't necessary. I do not think they believed much, if anything, of what they said: the time was ripe for a new wave in America, and they seized their political chance to lead it along each day's opportunity, spit-balling whatever and with whoever came into view. (35)

Based on Hellman's statements, the difference between Danforth and McCarthy was not in their power, but in McCarthy's exploitation of opportunities that served his best interest. In this respect, McCarthy acted more like Abigail Williams who, as Moss states, was a malicious figure able to gain control over the frightened and gullible (60).

Miller addresses the issue of loyalty on page 94, where Danforth states, "But you must understand, sir, that a person is either with this court or he must be counted against it, there is no road between." Danforth's statement parallels the literal witchhunt in Salem, when those who opposed the court were labeled witches, and Miller's metaphorical witchhunt, the HUAC hearings, when those

who opposed the Committee were labeled as Communists. In both the witchtrials and the HUAC hearings, the loyalty of those accused was tested—in Salem, the accused must acknowledge consorting with the Devil in order to be redeemed; in Washington, those called to testify were expected to name names, even though the members of the Communist Party had long since been established:

Only by once again hearing a recital of these familiar names could people on the Committee and in the industry feel sure about the new purity of these exiles. The systematic betrayal of one's friends and colleagues soon became an accepted way of regaining lost jobs in Hollywood, or in some cases of advancing a career on the basis of one's prowess as an informer. (Dardis 39)

Dardis' comments also apply to *The Crucible* when Giles is asked to give up the name of "an honest man" (96) who claims to have knowledge that Putnam is accusing people in order to get control of their land:

HATHORNE: And the name of this man?

GILES, *taken aback*: What name?

HATHORNE: The man that give you this information.

GILES, *hesitates, then*: Why, I—I cannot give you his name.

HATHORNE: And why not?

GILES, *hesitates, then bursts out*: You know well why not! He'll lay in jail if I give his name!

HATHORNE: This is contempt of the court, Mr. Danforth!

DANFORTH, *to avoid that*: You will surely tell us the name.

GILES: I will not give you no name. I mentioned my wife's name once and I'll burn in hell long enough for that. I stand mute. (96-97)

The repetition of "name" in this passage, as well as the question/answer format of the dialogue, is reminiscent to the questioning of Tituba in Act I. Once again, a feeling of pathos is established, this time for Giles, whose innocent question about his wife's desire to read books is the basis of her arrest for witchcraft. This passage also exhibits a cause and effect relationship: by refusing to name names, Giles is (like Miller in HUAC) threatened with contempt of court, even though Giles is at a hearing and court is not officially in session. Danforth and Hathorne believe that by threatening Giles with contempt, he "will surely" comply to the court's request. In essence, the officers of the court are using their power to blackmail Giles into

compliance, as seen in the following passage:

GILES: This is a hearing; you cannot clap me for contempt of a hearing.
DANFORTH: Oh, it is a proper lawyer! Do you wish me to declare the court in full session here? Or will you give me good reply? (97)

By calling Giles “a proper lawyer,” Danforth uses sarcasm to patronize him. This passage contradicts the earlier allusions regarding Danforth’s convictions and instead establishes him as one who lacks concern for fairness, or even the law itself. Miller, through Danforth’s dialogue, portrays the Deputy Governor as a man obsessed with getting compliance, even if he must alter legal procedures to get his way. Last, “hearing” offers both literal and figurative semantic implications. Giles believes that by being at a hearing, he is not at risk for retribution—a belief he soon learns is false. Thus, “hearing” now implies a sense of danger. The similarities between the witchtrials and the Congressional Hearings of the 1940s and 1950s allow the negative connotation of “hearing” to transcend the context of the play to those individuals brought to testify before HUAC.

Giles’ comment regarding “Hell” presents an interesting reversal. Giles originally volunteers information to those in authority—information that leads to his wife’s arrest. Essentially, Giles states that by cooperating with the court he will not be rewarded for his virtue but rather will “burn in hell” for his actions. With this reversal, Miller creates a bleak metaphor for those who, against their better judgment, conform to the demands of authority, be it in Salem or at the HUAC hearings.

The issue of a “list” occurs when a testament of local resident’s signatures is offered to the court to prove the innocence of Rebecca Nurse, Elizabeth Proctor, and Martha Corey:

DANFORTH, *glancing down a long list*: How many names are here?
FRANCIS: Ninety-one, Your Excellency.
PARRIS, *sweating*: These people should be summoned. *Danforth looks up at him questioningly*. For questioning.
FRANCIS, *trembling with anger*: Mr. Danforth, I gave them all my word no harm would come to them for signing this. (93-94)

The townspeople's list of signatures parallels the Attorney General's list that Willis cites as the beginning of the blacklist. According to Willis, the Attorney General's list was compiled in 1947 as a screening mechanism to ensure prospective federal employees had no Communist, Fascist, totalitarian or subversive ties (8). Willis believes this tool was the basis for the blacklisting campaign: "This List, intended to supply prima facie reason for investigating federal employees, was used to deny people employment in any position, private or public" (9). Miller, along with many others, was awed by the blacklist's ability to damage people's lives: "In 1946 I do not think we could have believed that such a blacklist was possible, that the current of one's life and career could simply be switched off and the wires left dead" (*Timebends* 269).

In addition to the similarities between Francis Nurse's list of names and the HUAC blacklist are the semantic implications brought out by Nurse's use of "harm." Francis' statement implies common knowledge amongst the locals that becoming involved with the court proceedings—as in the form of signing a petition—will result in personal misfortune. In stressing the number of signatures, "Ninety-one," Miller demonstrates the town's feelings toward the current actions of the court. Nearly one hundred of the residents voice an opinion through their signatures and, even with Francis Nurse's assurances, place themselves in a position of risk by disagreeing with the proceedings.

The intense pressure of interrogation resurfaces in Act III when Mary Warren confesses before Danforth that her participation in the witch sightings was a lie.

MARY WARREN: . . . I—I used to faint because I—I thought I saw spirits.

DANFORTH: *Thought* you saw them!

MARY WARREN: But I did not, Your Honor.

DANFORTH: How could you think you saw them unless you saw them.

MARY WARREN: I—I cannot tell how, but I did. I—I heard the other girls screaming, and you, Your Honor, you seemed to believe them, and I—It were only sport in the beginning, sir, but then the whole world cried spirits, spirits, and I—I promise you, Mr. Danforth, I only thought I saw

them but I did not. (107)

Miller uses both punctuation and sentence structure to show Mary Warren crumbling under the pressure of interrogation. Though she is telling the truth, her language takes on a choppy, rambling quality. To accomplish this, Miller uses dashes with “I” to make the character stammer, as if she is not certain of her statements. Also, her second sentence has false starts such as “I—it.” She also shifts from the idea that “the whole world cried spirits” to her promise to Danforth that she saw none.

Mary Warren’s statement contrasts Danforth’s questioning of Abigail Williams on the grounds that Abigail’s testimony is pretense:

DANFORTH: . . . I bid you now drop your guile and confess your pretense, for a quick confession will go easier with you. *Pause.* Abigail Williams, rise. *Abigail slowly rises.* Is there any truth in this?

ABIGAIL: No, sir. (102)

Whereas Mary Warren, armed with the truth, is presented as a person ready to break down under pressure, Abigail, with her abrupt answer “No, sir,” is completely in control and shows no hesitation to lie if it benefits her. Abigail is so confident in her lies that she even questions authority figures on page 108:

ABIGAIL, *in an open threat*: Let you beware, Mr. Danforth. Think you to be so mighty that the power of Hell may not turn your wits? Beware of it!

Miller not only uses these passages to pose questions about the concept of truth, he also demonstrates to his audience that testimony, be it forced or volunteered, does not guarantee honesty and may be offered solely for personal gain.

Abigail and the other girls use repetition to do some bewitching of their own before the court when their allegations come under question by Mary Warren:

DANFORTH, *apprehensively*: What is it, child?

ABIGAIL, *looking about in the air, clasping her arms about her as though cold*: I—I know not. A wind, a cold wind, has come. *Her eyes fall on Mary Warren.*

MARY WARREN, *terrified, pleading*: Abby!

PROCTOR: They’re pretending!

HATHORNE, *touching Abigail’s hand*: She is cold, Your Honor, touch her!

MERCY LEWIS, *through chattering teeth*: Mary, do you send this shadow on me?

MARY WARREN: Lord, save me!

SUSANNA WALCOTT: I freeze, I freeze!

ABIGAIL, *shivering visibly*: It is a wind, a wind!

MARY WARREN: Abby, don't do that!

DANFORTH, *himself engaged and entered by Abigail*: Mary Warren, do you witch her? I say to you, do you send your spirit out. (108-09)

Abigail and the other accusers literally use repetition as a weapon of persuasion.

The girls create a chanting quality that has a captivating rhythm as in "I freeze, I freeze" and "a wind, a wind"—a rhythm captivating enough to "engage and enter" an authority figure like the Deputy Governor himself. Moss defines the strategy of the girls as: "They first completely demoralize their victim, then subtly implant in him the terms of a confession that will release him from suspicion and at the same time achieve their own devious ends" (60-61).

The girl's use of repetition is a precursor to their *possession* by Mary Warren when their prior repetitive strategies are magnified for maximum effect:

DANFORTH, *to Mary Warren*: Why does she [Abigail] see this vision?

MARY WARREN: She sees nothin'!

ABIGAIL, *now staring full front as though hypnotized, and mimicking the exact tone of Mary Warren's cry*: She sees nothin'!

MARY WARREN, *pleading*: Abby, you mustn't!

ABIGAIL AND ALL THE GIRLS, *all transfixed*: Abby, you mustn't!

MARY WARREN, *to all the girls*: I'm here, I'm here!

GIRLS: I'm here, I'm here!

DANFORTH, *horrified*: Mary Warren! Draw back your spirit out of them!

The girls continue to mimic Mary Warren, continually breaking her will to tell the truth:

MARY WARREN, *turning on them all hysterically and stamping her feet*: Abby, stop it!

GIRLS, *stamping their feet*: Abby, stop it!

MARY WARREN: Stop it!

GIRLS: Stop it!

MARY WARREN, *screaming it out at the top of her lungs, and raising her fists*: Stop it!!

GIRLS, *raising their fists*: Stop it!!

Mary Warren, *utterly confounded, and becoming overwhelmed by*

Abigail—and the girls’—utter conviction, starts to whimper, hands half raised, powerless, and all the girls begin whimpering exactly as she does. (115-16)

This passage, above all else, establishes the girls’ relentlessness. The repetition creates a frenzy of emotion as Mary Warren becomes increasingly helpless to resist the will of her tormentors. The short sentences also enhance the speed and power of the scene. Last, Miller’s stage directions take the dramatic elements from an aural to a physical dimension by having Mary Warren and the girls “stomp their feet,” which generates sound and motion, and the “raising of fists,” which emphasizes body language. Miller’s combination of rhetorical techniques instills a sense of helplessness in his audience—young girls, relishing in an obvious ploy, have not only taken command of the situation but have gained the confidence of those in power; meanwhile sensible men, like John Proctor, are powerless to stop this charade and must sit idle. Even though a courtroom environment should offer some sense of stability and order, Miller presents a situation entirely out of control. This creates dissonance in the scene as well as in the audience.

Miller’s rhetorical techniques also showcase the transformation of Reverend Hale’s views regarding the actions of the court—a transformation that provides a contrast to the steadfast Danforth. According to Martin, “Although he was at first as overly zealous in his pursuit of witches as everyone else . . . Hale began to be tormented by doubts early in the proceedings” (99). These initial doubts are shown in his dialogue with Proctor in Act II when he stammers “I—have indeed” (69). Hale’s weakening conviction differs from his earlier dialogue that portrayed him as a man of authority secure in his beliefs:

Here are all your familiar spirits—your incubi and succubi; your witches that go by land, by air and by sea; your wizards of the night and of the day. Have no fear now—we shall find him [the Devil] out if he has come among us, and I mean to crush him utterly if he has shown his face! (39)

Hale’s dialogue here is strong and forceful; he is versed in his knowledge of

“witches” and “wizards” and seems to know how to remedy Salem’s dilemma by “crushing” the Devil. He has taken on the burden of Salem and uses his authority to ease the concerns of the public, as noted in his statement “Have no fear now.” Although Hale is originally secure in his beliefs, inconsistencies present in Salem begin to diminish his faith in the court. The passion and length of Hale’s dialogue decrease as the play progresses and he soon questions the decisions of court officers like Danforth:

HALE: Excellency, he [Giles] claims hard evidence for his wife’s defense. I think that in all justice you must—

DANFORTH: Then let him submit his evidence in proper affidavit. You are certainly aware of our procedure here, Mr. Hale. (86)

This exchange depicts the polarization between Hale and Danforth—men who originally had a similar goal. Hale now seeks “justice” and the truth of the various claims; Danforth is not concerned with the truth of the allegations but rather with the procedure of the court. On page 94, Hale continues questioning the logic of the court by stating “Is every defense an attack upon the court.” He adds on page 99:

HALE: Excellency, I have signed seventy-two death warrants; I am a minister of the Lord, and I dare not take a life without there be a proof so immaculate no slightest qualm of conscience may doubt it.

Hale’s concern for “conscience” and “doubts” are not mirrored by Danforth, who states on page 129:

DANFORTH: . . . I will not receive a single plea for pardon or postponement. Them that will not confess will hang.

He adds:

If retaliation is your fear, know this—I should hang ten thousand that dared to rise against the law, and an ocean of salt tears could not melt the resolution of the statutes.

Danforth—unlike Hale, whose confidence in the court is waning—is convinced his actions are proper and his dialogue emphasizes his conviction. The use of “will” displays an unyielding sense of conviction; no extenuating circumstances can sway

Danforth's resolve for compliance. In addition, Danforth's references to "ten thousand," and "an ocean of salt" show the same authority and passion that Hale's diction displays earlier in the play when the Reverend was convinced that "The Devil is precise; the marks of his presence are definite as stone" (38).

Hale further drives a wedge between himself and the court when he sides with Proctor and claims "the girl [Abigail] has always struck me false!" (114). Here "always" implies that Hale has questioned the validity of the townspeople's accusations since his arrival in Salem; he simply had no proof he considered legitimate enough to make him renounce his faith.

Hale's spiritual transformation is completed on page 132 when—after Mary Warren cracks under pressure and accuses Proctor of witchcraft, an act that forces Hale to quit the court in protest—he pleads with Elizabeth Proctor to have her husband fake a confession in order to spare his life. Hale states to Elizabeth:

Let you not mistake your duty as I mistook my own. . . . Beware, Goody Proctor—cleave to no faith when faith brings blood. It is mistaken law that leads you to sacrifice. Life, woman, life is God's most precious gift; no principle, however glorious, may justify the taking of it. I beg you, woman, prevail upon your husband to confess. Let him give his lie.

Hale's dialogue exhibits some of the passion he expressed in Act I but for an entirely different reason: Hale has become so outraged with the proceedings that he now asks a man to perjure himself before the court. Hale's dialogue illustrates his regrets with words like "mistake," "mistook," and "mistaken," emphasizing the preface "mis," meaning "wrong" or "bad" (*Webster* 384). The repetition of "life" suggests that the cost of losing one's life is far greater than the cost of a "lie." The reference to "God" elevates the status of "life": life is not simply a mortal state constituted by mortal decisions; life is ethereal. By refusing to confess the accused forsake "God's most precious gift."

Unfortunately for Proctor, Rebecca Nurse, and others, the choice for "life" is not as straightforward as Hale proposes; to lie is to give up the individual's *name*.

The relevance of a person's name surfaces in various contexts throughout the play, primarily the importance of not giving one's name away. This is seen on page 110 when Proctor, after acknowledging his affair with Abigail, states, "A man will not cast away his good name. You surely know that." He adds, "I have made a bell of my honor! I have rung the doom of my good name" (111). The repetition of "name" signifies the importance of a person's name in the community. "You surely know that" implies maintaining an individual's name is common knowledge (an issue addressed in Act I with Abigail's defense of her "name" on page 12). Proctor's bell metaphor cements the relationship between a being's name and honor. This is accomplished with the parallelism between the prepositional phrases "of my honor" and "of my good name."

Miller recognizes the detrimental influence confessing has upon a person's name, in this case the name of John Proctor, which he gives up on the eve of his hanging:

Proctor turns from her [Elizabeth] to Hathorne; he is off the earth, his voice hollow.

PROCTOR: I want my life.

HATHORNE, *electrified, surprised*: You'll confess yourself?

PROCTOR: I will have my life.

HATHORNE, *with a mystical tone*: God be praised! It is a providence! *He rushes out the door, and his voice is heard calling down the corridor:* He will confess! Proctor will confess!

PROCTOR, *with a cry, as he strides to the door*: Why do you cry it? *In great pain he turns back to her [Elizabeth]*. It is evil, is it not? It is evil. (137-38)

The relationship between *confessing* and having one's life spared by the court is detailed in the dialogue between Proctor and Hathorne. Proctor never actually states that he will confess; however, stating he "wants his life" is synonymous with confessing, as seen in Hathorne's reply, "You'll confess yourself?" Miller's stage directions indicate how important Proctor's confession is to the court. Hathorne is not just pleased; he is "electrified, surprised." Furthermore, Hathorne "rushes out the door" and calls out to make it known. This is a strong contrast to Proctor's

response to his forthcoming confession; he speaks “with a cry” and “strides,” not “rushes,” out the door. Proctor’s shame is shown in his question, “Why do you cry it?” Proctor’s next sentences, “It is evil, is it not? It is evil” offer a reversal much like Giles’ reference to “Hell” on page 97. Hathorne’s glee at Proctor’s confession makes the act seem worthwhile, yet Proctor, knowing it is a lie, feels he is committing an evil act.

Proctor’s confession serves as a direct parallel to Miller’s testimony before HUAC:

Danforth, now sensing trouble, glances at John and goes to the table, and picks up a sheet—the list of condemned.

DANFORTH: Did you ever see her [Rebecca Nurse] sister, Mary Easty, with the Devil?

PROCTOR: No, I did not.

DANFORTH, *his eyes narrow on Proctor*: Did you ever see Martha Corey with the Devil?

PROCTOR: I did not.

DANFORTH, *realizing, slowly putting the sheet down*: Did you ever see anyone with the Devil?

PROCTOR: I did not.

Danforth adds:

DANFORTH: Mr. Proctor, a score of people have already testified they saw this woman with the Devil.

PROCTOR: Then it is proved. Why must I say it?

DANFORTH: Why “must” you say it! Why, you should rejoice to say it if your soul is truly purged of any love for Hell!

PROCTOR: They think to go like saints. I like not to spoil their names. (140-41)

In similar fashion to Miller’s and Hellman’s testimony before HUAC, Proctor says he will confess himself but, to Danforth’s dismay, refuses to comment on the acts of others. This is seen in the repetition between Danforth’s grilling questions “Did you ever see . . .” and Proctor’s adamant response “I did not.”

That others have testified to the alleged guilt of the condemned women also offers parallels to the HUAC hearings. As Dardis states, “The fact that the Committee members, as well as the FBI, knew these names so well by then that

they could recite them in their sleep, made no difference. It was the principle of the thing, the act of betrayal that counted in this self-degradation process" (40). Thus, even though Rebecca Nurse and the others are *named* in prior testimony, Proctor respects their inner conviction not to acquiesce to authority as he is now doing; for Proctor, their choice makes them "like saints," which is why he cannot "spoil their names" by accusing them of witchcraft.

A new dimension to Proctor's dilemma surfaces when he learns that not only will his confession be written down, but he must also sign his name to it:

PROCTOR, *with a cold, cold horror at their efficiency*: Why must it be written?

DANFORTH: Why, for the good instruction of the village, Mister; this we shall post on the church door! (138)

Miller's descriptive stage direction, "cold, cold horror," defines Proctor's reluctance at having his confession written down. After all, a written document is permanent and tangible; this bothers Proctor immensely, for he would like the matter forgotten as soon as possible, while his oppressors see his confession as a prize for the court.

Because of Proctor's rapport with the community, Parris and Hale consider Proctor to have a "weighty name" and, though Proctor does not name others, repeatedly urge Danforth to "Let him [Proctor] sign it [his confession]" (141). The repetition of this phrase, combined with Miller's stage directions, "quickly to Danforth" and "feverishly," show the desperation of the two clergymen: Parris, because the court is quickly losing favor with the community; Hale, to try and save an innocent man's life.

Proctor, in his shame, is reluctant to sign his name on a pretentious document:

DANFORTH, *considers; then with dissatisfaction*: Come, then, sign your testimony. *To Cheever*: Give it to him. *Cheever goes to Proctor, the confession and a pen in hand. Proctor does not look at it.* Come, man, sign it.

PROCTOR, *after glancing at the confession*: You have all witnessed it—it is enough.

DANFORTH: You will not sign it?

PROCTOR: You have all witnessed it; what more is needed.

DANFORTH: Do you sport with me? You will sign your name or it is no confession, Mister! (141-42).

The discourse between Danforth and Proctor details Proctor's shame but, more importantly, offers a distinction between witnessing an act and signing one's name to it. For Proctor, signing his name legitimizes the confession. For this reason, he uses repetition in the form of "You have all witnessed it" as a ploy to avoid using his signature. Eventually he signs his name but withholds the document, stating that by publicly displaying his confession the court is overstepping its bounds:

PARRIS: Proctor, the village must have proof that—

PROCTOR: Damn the village! I confess to God, and God has seen my name on this! It is enough!

DANFORTH: No, sir, it is—

PROCTOR: You came to save my soul, did you not? Here! I have confessed myself; it is enough!

DANFORTH: You have not con—

PROCTOR: I have confessed myself! Is there no good penitence but it be public? God does not need my name nailed upon the church! God sees my name; God knows how black my sins are! It is enough! (142)

The use of exclamation points emphasizes Proctor's outrage at having to comply with the court's procedures, which seem to be superseding the needs of God. The repetition of "God" affirms Proctor's belief that a confession is not "public" but rather a private act between a man and God. This belief is the basis for the repetition of "It is enough!" Yet since the court needs a public spectacle showing the validity of their actions, Proctor's confession, regardless of his assertions, is not enough.

In his frustration, Proctor, like Eddie Carbone at the conclusion of *View*, begins addressing himself by name, first in a discussion with Elizabeth about whether he should confess, "God in heaven, what is John Proctor, what is John Proctor" (138), and then before the court: "I am John Proctor! You will not use me! It is no part of salvation that you should use me" (143). Finally, after deciding to face the gallows rather than to confess falsely, he states, "You have made your magic now, for now I do think I see some shred of goodness in John Proctor"

(144). Interestingly, in the first instance, Proctor does not ask *who* he is but instead “what” he is. Questioning *who* a person is relates to identity; questioning “what” a person is relates to the essence of an individual’s very being; hence, Miller’s diction indicates that a person who gives a false confession may be more animal than human.

The protagonists in *View* and *The Crucible* are both sacrificed in an attempt to “get” or “maintain” their names. Since Miller chose to end two of his plays on this theme, one must wonder why the playwright was so adamant about emphasizing one’s name. A statement by John Howard Lawson may hold a key to Miller’s concerns about his characters’ giving up their names. Navasky quotes Lawson:

“A writer’s name,” he said, “is his most cherished possession. It is the basis of his economic life, and the ‘trademark’ which establishes his competence and craftsmanship. It is more than the means by which he earns his bread. It is his creative personality, the symbol of the whole body of his ideas and experience.” (183)

Since neither John Proctor nor Eddie Carbone are writers, Miller’s emphasis on maintaining a person’s “name” takes on a more universal appeal. For Miller, a person’s name is akin to a person’s identity, and in “giving up” the individual’s identity a person becomes the human equivalent of a hollow shell. This is the basis of Miller’s moral problems with the court in Salem and the HUAC hearings: both entities forced people to give up their names and the names of others, which, in essence, usurped people of their identity and integrity. As Lee J. Cobb says, “The human animal is not noble. That’s why we celebrate those few who are” (qtd. in Navasky 272). Perhaps this is the appeal of John Proctor and those who stand up to unjust authority—for these people, in maintaining their names, remain true to themselves, and though most people would like to state they would do the same, few have the courage to actually make this sacrifice.

CHAPTER FOUR

CONCLUSION

Arthur Miller's *A View from the Bridge* and *The Crucible* are complimentary in that each play addresses the issue of informing, yet each studies the topic in disparate ways. In *View*, Miller explores the factors that can possess a person to inform on another. *The Crucible*, on the other hand, is not as concerned with what motivates an informer but rather with the devastation that can occur as the result of informing. The common denominator in these plays is that informing, regardless of the motivations of the informer, can cause innocent people to suffer needlessly: Eddie Carbone's family in *View*, and the entire community of Salem in *Crucible*. Because of the time period these plays were presented to the public, the plays' themes serve as analogies for the House Committee on Un-American Activities hearings as well as the plight of those called to testify before HUAC.

Miller was compelled to address the inherent injustice found in *View*, *Crucible*, and the HUAC hearings, and defines his task: "In effect, I was calling for an act of will. I was trying to say that injustice has features, that the amorphousness of our world is so in part because we have feared through guilt to unmask its ethical outlines" (*Essays* 229). If Miller were to accomplish this goal, he had to use his plays to persuade his audience: "I felt bound to persuade an audience equipped with nothing but common sense at best. Despite everything, I still thought writing had to try and save America, and that meant grabbing people and shaking them by the back of the neck" (*Timebends* 547).

To effectively persuade his audience, Miller had to delve beyond surface-level similarities between his plays and HUAC, primarily regarding the obvious thematic implications. Furthermore, Miller could not overtly address the key issues of his day, for this would diminish the dramatic force of his dramas. Esslin views minimizing overt implications between life and art as the control-mechanisms of

drama:

Because of the peculiar nature of drama as an instrument of knowledge, of perception, thought, insight about society, its concreteness and the fact that drama never makes an overt statement, that by its very nature it is always an experiment which always carries its own control-mechanism, its own verification, within it. (96)

Miller could not address HUAC too overtly in his plays, for this would compromise the integrity of his work; hence Miller needed to utilize language fully to pull his audience emotionally into his subject matter; he had to maximize the rhetorical elements inherent in drama to elicit an emotional response from theatergoers. Using rhetorical strategies offered Miller an ideal way to communicate his message to his audience. This is affirmed by John Harrington, who comments that rhetorical language implicitly or explicitly urges people to action (5).

Harrington also elaborates on the relationship between rhetoric and effective communication:

Rhetoric is a “how to” area of study focusing on ways of putting together the various components and complexities of languages in order to bring about effective communication. Hence rhetoric deals mainly with the way a sender’s message will influence a receiver (2).

As seen in *A View from the Bridge* and *The Crucible*, Miller used rhetoric not only to make theatergoers of the 1950s cognitively *aware* of the similarities between his plays and the Congressional hearings, he also used rhetoric to make his audience *feel* the injustice being addressed. Rhetorical elements such as repetition, syntax, diction, stage directions, and the dramatic emphasis noted by his punctuation served temporarily to victimize Miller’s audience, forcing acknowledgement of the injustices suffered by Marco and Rodolpho, John Proctor, and those, like Miller, called to testify before the Committee.

The two rhetorical strategies that set the plays apart from one another are repetition and diction. Although both rhetorical strategies are used in *View* and *Crucible*, Miller’s emphasis of each strategy within each work may help to explain

the longevity, or lack of longevity, for each play.

The strength of *View* is Miller's deft use of diction, primarily the associations established between the denotation of the characters' dialogue and the connotations these words had to the American theater audience in the 1950s. According to Harrington, connotation involves the implications associated with a word. He states, "Most words carry emotional overtones, and writers and speakers use these for rhetorical ends" (144). Hence, Miller, as a vehicle for persuasion, deftly chose words with connotative values that related to the issue of informing—an act commonplace to those living during the McCarthy era—such as "singer," "canary," "pigeon," "rat," and so on. Although the connotations found in Miller's diction served to bridge a gap between his dramatic context and the political considerations of 1950s, such connotations tend to lose their importance for future generations of theatergoers who have a different point of reference and are concerned with other issues. *View* still addresses many psychological and social issues; however, without the political and cultural base of the 1950s, much of the allegorical associations between art and life is lost. Thus, over time, the rhetorical strength of the play—detailing the plight of an informer—becomes less dominant; *View* loses its *anti-informer feeling* and subsequently emphasizes the tragic love triangle between Eddie, Catherine, and Rodolpho. The waning of *View*'s rhetorical dominance over time may be a reason *A View from the Bridge* is not one of Miller's better known works—*View* is simply not as relevant in subsequent decades as it was in the days of McCarthy.

As with *View*, the subject matter of *The Crucible* also related to McCarthyism. However, Miller's rhetorical strategies for this play downplays the connotations offered in *View* and instead focuses on strategies such as repetition that do not require prior knowledge on the part of his audience; the techniques used in *The Crucible* exhibit dramatic effects regardless of the audiences' knowledge of HUAC.

The levels of repetition Miller uses, primarily involving Abigail's *confessions*, effectively drill a sense of helplessness into the audience with such speed and power that this rhetorical strategy transcends time and place; Miller's use of rhetoric denotes that something is truly wrong in Salem.

In the 1950s, Miller's rhetorical strategies merged effectively with his subject matter creating the association that if confession in Salem could cause such hardships to innocent people, those confessing in Washington risked the same consequences. However, the rhetorical strategies are so powerful in *Crucible* that theatergoers do not need the political backdrop of McCarthyism to relate to the horrors being portrayed in the play. Just as rhetorical strategies may have hampered *View* for future generations, the strategies used in *Crucible* may have fortified the play over time, primarily since these strategies force the audience to consider the subject matter on different levels. Esslin believes a multi-dimensional approach to the play's subject matter is essential for its longevity:

If the play is accepted by the consensus of the audience as a convincing picture of the situation, which will always have two sides from which it can be seen, it will have a profound effect, but a long-term one, by lingering in the minds of the audiences and by gradually making them realize the complexity of the situation depicted. (*Anatomy* 97)

The rhetorical strategies used in *The Crucible* truly "linger in the mind of the audience." Even if the audience is completely unfamiliar with Senator McCarthy and his crusade against Communists, they will relate the injustice presented dramatically to other situations they may have encountered, as Miller addresses in *Timebends*:

In time, *The Crucible* became by far my most frequently produced play, both abroad and at home. Its meaning is somewhat different in different places and moments. I can almost tell what the political situation in a country is when the play is suddenly a hit there—it is either a warning of tyranny on the way or a reminder of tyranny just past. (348)

Perhaps emphasizing the issue of injustice was Miller's true rhetorical goal in writing *View* and *Crucible*, be it in 1950s America or anytime anywhere.

Concurrent with emphasizing injustice is a latent plea somehow to take action to stop it before the innocent become victims. In writing these plays, and with his testimony before HUAC, Miller tried to take a stand against not only McCarthyism but also what he considered “a political, objective, knowledgeable campaign from the far Right [that] was capable of creating not only a terror, but a new subjective reality, a veritable mystique which was gradually assuming even a holy resonance” (Miller, *Essays* 153). Miller, by taking the First Amendment rather than the Fifth Amendment (a tactic that could have resulted in a jail sentence), made a sacrifice at the risk of his own well-being in the hope of sending a message of protest to both HUAC and the American public.

The issue of self-sacrifice is an undercurrent for Miller’s rhetorical strategies, for these strategies not only stress each play’s dramatic premise (incestuous lust in *View*, and mass hysteria in *Crucible*), but also illuminate the plight of the protagonists, both of whom tragically lose their lives. The difference between them is that Eddie Carbone cannot sacrifice his passion for his niece, even though such action is in her best interest; hence, nothing can be gained by Eddie’s death. Conversely, John Proctor, who, in refusing his confession to the court, willingly upholds his responsibility to himself and, ultimately, to the community; Proctor sacrifices his life to make a stand against injustice.

According to Navasky, those like Proctor who sacrificed their lives rather than submit false confessions to the court, were catalysts for the court’s downfall and the end of the Salem witchtrials (212). Although Miller’s audience was not privy to this knowledge, the repetition of Proctor’s name—as seen when questioning his identity, “what is John Proctor, what is John Proctor” and his eventual affirmation of self, “I am John Proctor! You will not use me!”—somehow conveys that Proctor’s sacrifice is worth the cost for he is true to himself even in the greatest adversity.

Miller states that one of his goals as a playwright is to create awareness in his

audience: "I believe that the wider the awareness, the felt knowledge, evoked by a play, the higher it must stand as art" (*Essays* 173). Because he has only a short time to reach his audience, Miller's rhetoric transports his audience into the horrors of the respective situation he is addressing; hence, he uses language, both implicitly and explicitly, to communicate his message to theatergoers.

Esslin cites the communicative value of drama as an ongoing process; the members of the audience evaluate the various rhetorical elements of the play to elicit meaning from what they have experienced:

This is a process which begins during the performance but can, and frequently will, continue over considerable periods of time, during which the impressions consciously formed during the performance and the subliminal, or wholly unconscious, perceptions, moods, atmospheres, instinctual attractions and dislikes it has evoked, will gradually coalesce and develop, until, in the end, the memory of the experience consolidates itself into a lasting image or impression which becomes part of the individual's store of remembered experience that constitutes his or her personal inner world and contributes to her or his total, evolving, identity. (*Field* 162)

Because plays communicate meaning to such a vast audience, drama provides an effective medium for politically-oriented playwrights, like Miller, to rhetorically channel their concerns to the masses; in fact, Esslin believes that drama offers vehicles to change social attitudes, at least in the long run:

Thus, on the whole, drama may not be very effective in achieving short term political objectives. In the long term, on the other hand, it has been and remains a powerful influence on changing social attitudes, on the gradual development of the collective consciousness. It is not the direct appeal, the surface message that is most effective, but in keeping with the essential nature of the dramatic, the indirect implications of the dramatic action, the meaning that emerges, as it were, between the lines of the dialogue, from the wider reverberations of the action. (*Field* 172)

Last, Esslin views the relationship between drama and social change as reciprocal in that the changing views in society are reflected in drama, which in turn change the moral climate of society. This shift sets the stage for the next phase of change that will, in turn, again eventually be reflected in drama (*Field* 173). If

Esslin's conjectures are accurate, Miller's efforts to implement social change through drama are successful in that his rhetoric is assimilated by his audience and serves as a warning for current and future generations of theatergoers. Miller's sociopolitical message, conveyed through the rhetorical strategies in *View* and *Crucible*, is that just because we live in a different era from that being addressed, we cannot be fooled into thinking that fear and paranoia will not re-manifest under a different guise but with a similar effect—the suffering of the innocent.

Perhaps the underlying basis for Miller's rhetorical strategies is that the horrors of the past will ultimately resurface. Of this concern, the playwright asks, "Can it all happen again? I believe it can. Will it?" (*Essays* 299). To address his own fear, Miller uses drama to make his audience empathize with the terror of irrationality, without actually being subjected to the consequences, in the hope that people will recognize the symptoms of hysteria and take some form of action before panic is set into motion. Using the Vietnam war as an example, Miller discusses how easily paranoia could once again engulf the American public:

But what will happen if the American becomes more desperately frustrated, if this war goes on for years, if a sense of national powerlessness prepares the ground for cries of 'Betrayal!'—the old paranoid cry to which the highly moral mad respond by seeing where others are blind? (*Essays* 299)

This warning is essential not only for Americans, but also for the human race, because, like it or not, we do not learn lessons well, especially unpleasant lessons. Regardless of how sophisticated each generation of people deems itself, the symptoms for hysteria are consistently amongst us. The fear, jealousy, and hatred that jelled together in the 1690s and 1950s could easily be manifested at any time. I hope that Miller's rhetorical strategies serve as a beacon to the public, that in his efforts of persuasion and building audience awareness, he has, in fact, used rhetoric to instill an uneasiness in theatergoers, an uneasiness that reminds us that some lessons in life simply cannot be forgotten.

NOTES

¹ The sexual tension between Beatrice and Eddie is addressed on pages 31-32 when Beatrice voices her fear that she is no longer desirable to Eddie. Beatrice confronts Eddie and inquires when she “is gonna be a wife again,” implying the lack of intimacy in their relationship. Eddie blames his dwindling desire on the disruption in their lifestyle caused by Rodolpho and Marco. Beatrice reminds Eddie that he has not been amorous for three months, much longer than the two weeks her cousins have been in America. The couple’s discourse indicates the root of Eddie’s neglect of Beatrice is caused not by her cousins, but by Eddie’s escalating obsession with Catherine.

² That Abigail Williams “drank a charm to kill Goody Proctor” (19) is a response to the longstanding animosity between the two women. Abigail, the Proctor’s former servant and John Proctor’s one-time mistress, was fired after Elizabeth learned of her husband’s sexual improprieties. Miller’s rhetoric throughout the play indicates that Abigail is resentful toward Elizabeth (who claims that Abigail is a harlot) and seeks the chance to regain John Proctor’s affection by any means possible.

WORKS CITED

- American Heritage Dictionary*. 1983 ed.
- Babbie, Earl R. *Sociology: An Introduction*. Belmont: Wadsworth Publishing, 1980.
- Carlise, Olga, and Rose Styron. "Arthur Miller: An Interview." *Writers at Work: The Paris Review Interviews*. 3rd Series. Ed. George Plimpton. New York: Viking, 1967. 197-230.
- Carson, Neil. *Arthur Miller*. New York: St. Martin's, 1982. 60-76.
- Dardis, Tom. "The Plight of the Left-Wing Screenwriter." *Politics and the Muse*. Ed. Adam Sorkin. Bowling Green: Bowling Green State U Popular P, 1989. 39-46.
- Dick, Bernard F. *Radical Innocence: A Critical Study of the Hollywood Ten*. Lexington: UP of Kentucky, 1989.
- Esslin, Martin. *An Anatomy of Drama*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1976.
- . *The Field of Drama: How the Signs of Drama Create Meaning on Stage and Screen*. New York: Methuen, 1987.
- Grambs, David. *The Random House Dictionary for Writers and Readers*. New York: Random, 1990.
- Harrington, John. *The Rhetoric of Film*. San Francisco: Holt, 1973.
- Hellman, Lillian. *Scoundrel Time*. New York: Bantam, 1976.
- Martin, Robert A. "The Crucible: Background and Sources." *Critical Essays on Arthur Miller*. Ed. James Martine. Boston: G.K. Hall, 1979. 93-104.
- McConnell, James V. *Understanding Human Behavior*. San Francisco: Holt, 1980.
- Miller, Arthur. *The Crucible*. New York: Bantam, 1959.
- . *The Theater Essays of Arthur Miller*. Ed. Robert A. Martin, New York: Penguin, 1978.
- . ---. "On Social Plays." 51-68.
- . ---. "Brewed in *The Crucible*." 51-68.
- . ---. "It Could Happen Here—And Did." 294-300.
- . *A View from the Bridge*. New York: Viking, 1960.
- . *Timebends: A Life*. New York: Grove, 1987.
- Moffett, James. "Drama: What is Happening." *Teaching The Universe of Discourse*. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook, 1968. 60-119.

Morgan, Edmund S. "Arthur Miller's *The Crucible* and the Salem Witch Trials: A Historian's View." *The Golden and Brazen World: Papers in Literature and History, 1650-1800*. Ed. John M. Wallace. Berkley: U of California P, 1985. 171-86.

Moss, Leonard. *Arthur Miller*. Boston: Twayne Publishers, 1967.

Navasky, Victor S. *Naming Names*. New York: Penguin, 1981.

Partridge, Eric. *A Concise Dictionary of Slang and Unconventional English*. Ed. Paule Beale. New York: Macmillan, 1989.

Porter, Thomas E. "The Long Shadow of the Law: *The Crucible*." *Critical Essays on Arthur Miller*. Ed. James Martine. Boston: G.K. Hall, 1979. 75-92.

Shaw, Harry. *Punctuate It Right!* 8th ed. San Francisco: Harper, 1983.

United States. Cong. "Testimony of Miss Lillian Hellman, accompanied by her counsel, Joseph L. Rauh, Jr." *Hearings Before The Committee on Un-American Activities House of Representatives*. 82nd Cong., 2nd Sess. Washington: GPO, 1952. 3541-49.

---. ---. "Testimony of Arthur Miller, accompanied by his counsel, Joseph L. Rauh, Jr." *Hearings Before The Committee on Un-American Activities House of Representatives*. 84nd Cong., 2nd Sess. Washington: GPO, 1956. 1-38.

Vaughn, Jack A. *Drama A to Z: A Handbook*. New York: Ungar, 1978.

Webster's New World Dictionary. 1984 ed.

Willis, Gary. Introduction. *Scoundrel Time*. By Lillian Hellman. New York: Bantam, 1976. 1-31.